



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE LATIN VERSIONS OF FIRST ESDRAS¹

BY HARRY CLINTON YORK, PH.D.

Jaffna College, Ceylon

Of Latin versions of First Esdras—or Third Ezra, as it was called by the Roman Catholic church—at least three are known: (1) the Vulgate; (2) the Old Latin, preserved in two manuscripts, the Colbertinus² and the Sangermanensis;³ and (3) the rendering of the Mansi⁴ manuscript, which preserves in a fragmentary way the Story of the Three Youths, together with brief excerpts or abridgments from parts of chaps. 5 to 8.

Of the above, only the Colbertinus and the Vulgate are preserved entire. The Sangermanensis extends through 5:3 only; and besides has suffered through scribal revision, as we shall see later. The Mansi, aside from being brief and fragmentary, is further a late translation, so that its importance is quite considerably lessened. Because of these conditions our attention is necessarily directed primarily to the Colbertinus and the Vulgate. We will, however, first examine the supplemental sources of information.

I. THE MANSI VERSION

The Mansi manuscript comes from a translation made presumably in the latter half of the fifth century, though possibly in the sixth. As noted above, it was edited and published by P. de Lagarde in 1892. This document is especially interesting. It consists for the most part of brief excerpts from the Old and New Testaments, a summarized history which proves to be little more than a genealogical

¹ Part of an investigation which was completed in May, 1908, at Yale University.

² The Colbertinus is an Old Latin codex of about the eighth or ninth century, the text of which is published in Peter Sabatier's *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae* (1751).

³ The Sangermanensis is an Old Latin codex of the same type as the Colbertinus, but dating about a century later. Its variant readings are noted by Sabatier in the above-mentioned publication (*B.S.L.V.A.*).

⁴ The Mansi manuscript was published by Paul de Lagarde in his "Septuaginta Studien" in *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1892).

record from Adam to Jesus. In such a summary it is to be expected that the author will treat his authorities with considerable freedom, yet we are not a little surprised to find that he has devoted so much space to the Ezra narrative. From this source he quotes at length, and—most remarkable of all—has incorporated the Story of the Three Youths practically entire. He also includes about half the letter of Artaxerxes to Ezra—III Ezra 8:9-30 (omitting vss. 15-25) = ll. 471-86 of Lagarde in *A.K.G.W. zu G.*—and the prayer of thanksgiving uttered by the “young man” (*iuvenis*, i.e., Zorobabel) of III Ezra 4:58-63b (ll. 459-65).

But the historical sections proper are thoroughly epitomized and quite subordinated. It is a matter of some wonder to conjecture just what documents the author had before him. He himself in his introduction includes the Old and New Testaments—“*genealogiae totius bibliothecae ex omnibus libris collectae veteris novique testamenti*”—extending to the time of “the blessed Cyprian.” But he also mentions “*ad nostram aetatem quid fuerit gestum apertissime monstratur, ex storiis collectum legalium mandatorum.*” All this is borne out in the subsequent pages of the document. He does not confine himself to Hebrew or Jewish history, but quotes with almost equal interest from the doings of Babylonian and Persian monarchs, or from the legends of Roman literature, from the mythical founding of Rome by Romulus and Remus down to the death of Valentinian III (ll. 339-70). He even quotes Vergil, “*Karthago, urbs antiqua fuit, Tyrii tenuere coloni*” (*Aeneid* i. 12-13), and uses the Roman method of reckoning time—“*undecimu Kal. Maias*” (l. 341) and “*nono Kal. April*” (l. 487). Moreover, he is a thorough master of the Latin language, as shown by both style and diction. For he has avoided most of the barbarisms exhibited by other translators; so that we have a much smoother text, and one that sounds less like “translation Latin” than either the Vulgate or the Old Latin. The style is simple and direct; unusual expressions are avoided; foreign idioms expunged; perfects sometimes translated by vivid presents; and a smooth, polished Latin secured.

The following table shows the portions of Ezra covered by the Mansi manuscript. The notation used is that of Lagarde in his “*Septuaginta Studien*” mentioned above.

I Esdras	Mansi	Canon. Ezra
	322.....	3: 2; 5: 2 (cf. Matt. 1: 12; Luke 3: 27)
	326-29.....	1: 7, 8
	329-33.....	1: 9-11
	357.....	1: 1 + II Chron. 36: 21; Jer. 25: 11; 29: 10
4: 42.....	371	
3: 1-4: 48.....	375-459	
4: 58-63 <i>b</i>	459-65	
5: 1, 4, 7, 41 <i>a</i>	465	
5: 41 <i>b</i> -43.....	466-69.....	2: 64-67
8: 1-7.....	470	
8: 9-14.....	471-79.....	7: 11 <i>a</i> ; 12-16 <i>a</i>
8: 26-30 <i>a</i>	480-86.....	7: 25-28
7: 12.....	487.....	6: 22
6: 2.....	488.....	5: 2
7: 5.....	489.....	6: 15

From the above table it appears that of the 130 lines of the Mansi version paralleled by Ezra, 75 lines are used in recording the Story of the Three Youths (exclusive of historical setting of same at beginning and conclusion), and 10 more by the letter of Artaxerxes to Ezra; leaving only about 40 lines devoted to history proper, or less than one-third; so that this version occupies a decidedly secondary position as regards positive contributions to the main Ezra problem, except in so far as it throws light on the textual condition of the other versions.

As to the date of this translation, on internal evidence we know that it is at least later than the death of Valentinian III, which occurred in 454 A.D. The author of the Mansi version refers to the death of the above emperor as taking place 508 years after Julius Caesar; for in ll. 361, 362 is the statement "A Gaio vero Iulio Cesare usque ad Valentiniani extremum vitae naufragium anni sunt quingenti octo." The author's chronology may be a trifle inaccurate here, but there can be no doubt as to the particular event to which he is referring.

The chief importance of the Mansi manuscript is in the support it gives at several points to readings of the Old Latin and the Vulgate otherwise unattested. In a number of instances what would otherwise be regarded as corruptions, or careless and inferior translations on the part of the authors of our two main versions, appear in the

light of the evidence given by Mansi to be accurate renderings of a form of the Greek tradition no longer preserved in any Greek codex. For the most part these unusual readings are of no great importance in themselves; yet as another line of evidence toward fixing the contention that there were in existence as late as the time when the Mansi translation was made Greek readings which have not come down to us in any Greek codex known today, the testimony of the Mansi manuscript is valuable. These several unusual readings will be treated at length later in our discussion under the head of the Old Latin and the Vulgate.

As I have said, what we have in the Mansi text is merely an excerpt. It is also to be noticed that this version frequently abridges by the omission of redundant words or phrases within the sentence. For example, in 3:2 Mans. omits the first half of the verse, *Καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς σατράπαις καὶ στρατηγοῖς καὶ τοπάρχαις τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν*, evidently simply because it could do so without loss of sense, regarding the preceding *πᾶσιν τοῖς μεγιστᾶσιν* as sufficiently comprehensive. In 3:4 Mans. translates but one of the expressions in the phrase *οἱ σωματοφύλακες, οἱ φυλάσσοντες τὸ σῶμα*, for the perfectly apparent reason that it is a double translation. (In this instance, it is true, cod. 44 does also omit one member; but such omission is characteristic of cods. 44 and 71, and other parallels prove that Mans. is far from following either of these.) Very similar to the first illustration is one found in 3:14, where *πάντας τοὺς μεγιστᾶνας τῆς Περσίδος καὶ τῆς Μηδίας καὶ σατράπας καὶ στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοπάρχας καὶ ὑπάτους, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν τῷ χρηματιστηρίῳ* is rendered in Mans. by the all-embracing "praepositos et maiores; sederunt autem et omnes principes." Cf. also 8:26(27).

Other examples where Mans. has thought to correct redundant or double translations are 4:3, omission of *καὶ δεσπόζει αὐτῶν* in the phrase *καὶ κυριεύει αὐτῶν καὶ δεσπόζει αὐτῶν*; 4:6, omission of *καὶ ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον ἀναγκάζοντες ἀναφέρουσι τοὺς φόρους τῷ βασιλεῖ* as a repetition of the preceding *καὶ ὅσοι οὐ στρατεύονται οὐδὲ πολεμοῦσιν ἀλλὰ γεωργοῦσιν τὴν γῆν, πάλιν ὅταν σπεύρωσι, θερίσαντες ἀναφέρουσιν τῷ βασιλεῖ*; 4:14, omission of *ἢ τίς ὁ κυριεύων αὐτῶν* as doublet of the preceding *τίς οὖν ὁ δεσπόζων αὐτῶν*; 4:38, omission of *ισχύει* as an expansion of *μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*; 8:10(11), omission

of αἰρετίζοντες as a variant of βουλομένους just preceding. Compare also 4:5 (end), τῷ βασιλεῖ κομίζουσιν πάντα, καὶ ἐὰν προνομέσωσιν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα, rendered by Mans. "regi adferunt quaecumque ceperint"; 4:23, the omission of ληστεύειν καὶ κλέπτειν because already implied in the context; 4:45, καὶ σὺ ἤξω οἰκοδομήσαι τὸν ναὸν ὃν ἐνεπύρισαν οἱ Ἰδουμαῖοι, ὅτε ἡρημώθη ἡ Ἰουδαία ὑπὸ τῶν Χαλδαίων, abridged by Mans. to "et tu novisti votum aedificare templum, quod incenderunt Chaldei, cum desolata esset Iudea."

Occasionally, however, the process seems to have been reversed, and a slight addition actually to have been made in the interest of clearness or forcefulness. Such is the rendering "quam cito praevallet vinum" for πῶς ὑπερισχύει ὁ οἶνος in 3:18; "hic est Zorobabel filius Salathiel de domo David, ex genere Fares de tribu Iuda" for οὗτός ἐστι Ζοροβαβέλ]—Gk L (and Colb.) adds ὁ τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰουδα—in 4:13 (cf. 5:5); "et in fluviis transire" for καὶ ποταμούς in 4:23; and "et si adrisisset ei, ridebat rex" for καὶ ἐὰν προσγελάσῃ αὐτῷ, γελᾷ in 4:31. Cf. also the addition of "Bene valeas" in 8:24(27).

As to the type of Greek which Mans. follows there are very slight data to guide us, partly for the reason that in the particular section which Mans. covers, A, B, and L⁵ are unusually close in their agreement with each other, and partly for the reason that the character of Mans. itself renders any argument from plus or minus quantities of little value. A mere suggestion that Mans. lies closest to Gk A is found in 8:25 (28) where A prefixes a clause καὶ εἶπεν Ἑσδρας ὁ γραμματεὺς not found in either B⁵ or L, but variously rendered by Colb., Vulgate, and Mans. This inference is borne out by the reading in 4:3 "faciunt," equivalent to ποιοῦσιν of several A codices (al. ποιήσουσιν) instead of ἐνακούουσιν of Gk B. In 4:45 also Mans. follows the reading of Gk A—τὸν ναὸν ὃν ἐνεπύρισαν οἱ Ἰδουμαῖοι, ὅτε ἐρημώθη ἡ Ἰουδαία ὑπὸ τῶν Χαλδαίων—in its "templum quod

⁵ Here, and in the following pages, Gk AB is used to denote the Egyptian recension and Gk L the Palestinian recension. In First Esdras Gk L is represented by codices 19, 93, and 108. Codex 19 is fragmentary, covering only a part of this book. In certain sections cod. 121 also appears to have been copied from an L text. Of the Egyptian recension Gk B is used for the readings of the B group, in First Esdras, however, embracing only codices B and 55. All other codices are grouped under the head of Gk A, which is thus regarded as a family. So, unless so specified, Gk A or Gk B does not mean simply the uncials A or B, but the two branches of the Egyptian recension which are represented by these uncials.

incenderunt Chaldei, cum desolata esset Iudea," rather than that of Gk B—τὸν ναὸν ὃν ἐνεπύρισαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, κκλ.

But while it is probable that Mans. is closer to Gk A than to Gk B or L, there are many passages in which it departs from all three. Whether Mans. descends from a branch of the A family which has not come down to us, or whether it represents simply an earlier and less corrupt form of the A tradition, may be futile to attempt to determine from the data available; but something of the sort seems probable. The evidence which points to this conclusion will be treated in detail in a later portion of this article.

II. THE VERSION OF THE SANGERMANENSIS MANUSCRIPT

The Sangermanensis MS dates in its present form from about 900 A.D., or approximately a century later than the Colbertinus. That it is, however, but a variant of the same Old Latin translation has been recognized, and is borne out by careful comparison. For the most part it agrees verbatim with the Colbertinus, and—as I shall endeavor to point out later—the instances where it appears to have the support of the Vulgate against the readings of the Colbertinus are in nearly every case the result of recension which the old version suffered, in which use was made of the Vulgate and probably also of the Greek.

The Sangermanensis is nevertheless of considerable critical value especially where in spite of the process of recension through which it has passed it still supports the reading of the Colbertinus, or where it indicates the probable source of error or corruption in the Old Latin; and we should be much poorer than we are in the material for textual criticism had we not this manuscript to aid us in forming an estimate of the character and condition of the Colbertinus, aside from the few points at which it helps in the determination of certain original readings of the Old Latin.

In the next few pages I shall endeavor to show proofs of this recension to which the text of the Sangermanensis manuscript has, I believe, been subjected.

1. *The Sangermanensis Text Influenced by the Vulgate*

Unfortunately for its value as a critical guide, the Sangermanensis text has suffered through editorial revision. One document which

has been used for this purpose has certainly been the Vulgate. It has not only been corrected from this source, but is also frequently conflate from it. In the main, however, it follows the text of the Colbertinus MS quite closely, and so attests its Old Latin origin. Furthermore, inasmuch as instances in which it has been compared with the Vulgate are usually readily recognizable and are relatively few in number, the Sangermanensis still acts as an important check and guide in our use of the Colbertinus and in the estimate to be put upon the Old Latin version.

Following is a list of the passages where the evidence appears surest that the Sangermanensis has been influenced by the Vulgate;

- 1:3 Colb. sanctificate vos Domino. Et posuerunt arcam sanctam
 Vulg. ut sanctificarent se Domino in positione sanctae arcae
 Sang. ut sanctificarent se Domino in positionem sanctam arcam

Since the reading of Colb. is in part attested by a variant conflate reading of codex 108, and is further partially attested by codices 44, 74, 106, 120, 121, 134, 236—which have the imperative ἀγιάσατε, corresponding to Colb. “sanctificate” as against ἀγιάσαι of the other codices—it is simplest to regard the variations in Sang. as due to the influence of the Vulgate.

- 1:5 Colb. secundum divisiones principatus cognationum vestrorum
 Vulg. et secundum particulam principatus paternam vestram
 Sang. et secundum particulam principatus paternarum vestrorum
- | | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Levitarum . . . | qui () fuerint |
| eorum | qui stant |
| quorum Levitarum | qui stant |

Here the readings of both Colb. and Vulg. are independently well attested by the Greek. The correction and conflation from the Vulgate are too apparent to require comment.

- 1:8 Colb. & Levitis
 Vulg. & sacerdotibus in Pascha
 Sang. & sacerdotibus in Pascha & Levitis

The above is especially significant, for the Colb. and Vulg. followed distinct Greek texts. The “in Pascha” of the Vulgate does not occur in the Greek at this point, but has resulted from the accidental omission by the Vulg. of an entire line. The reviser of Sang.,

however, did not recognize this fact, but inserted "in Pascha" along with the rest that he took from the Vulg., and then repeated the phrase later in its proper order.

- 1:38 Colb. Zachariam autem comprehendens adduxit
 Vulg. & Zaracelem apprehendens reduxit
 Sang. porro Zachariam apprehendens reduxit

By his attempt to correct in this instance the redactor has multiplied error; for he omits "autem"—which is thoroughly attested by δὲ of all codices—but retains "Zachariam," though this is plainly a corruption of *Ζαχαριμ* or *Ζαχαριην* of the Greek.

- 1:49 Colb. principes autem populi, & sacerdotes multa scelera
 Vulg. et duces populi Domini multa inique
 Sang. et duces autem populi & sacerdotum multa inique
 commiserunt
 gesserunt
 gesserunt

- 1:57 Colb. et erat servi ejus & filiorum ejus donec ut
 Vulg. et erat servi illius⁶ usque dum in
 Sang. et erat servi illius & filii illius usque dum per
 impletur⁷ verbum Domini
 repletionem verbi Domini
 impletionem verbi Domini

- 1:54 Colb. omnia vasa Domini sancta, majora & minora, & arcam Dei
 Vulg. omnia sacra vasa Domini,
 Sang. omnia sacra vasa Domini, pusilla & majora

- 2:1 Colb. regnante autem Cyro Persarum anno primo, ut
 Vulg. regnante Cyro rex Persarum in
 Sang. regnante Cyro Persarum anno primo in
 adimpleretur
 consummatione
 consummatione

- 2:3 Colb. et⁸ Dominus ejus cum eo ascendat in Hierusalem
 Vulg. Dominus ipsius ascendat cum eo in Jerusalem
 Sang. sit Dominus Deus ipsius cum eo & ascendat in Jerusalem

⁶ The Vulgate probably originally read "& filii illius," like Sang.; but if so these words have now been lost.

⁷ "impletur" has been carelessly written "impleret" by Colb.

⁸ "et" is very likely a corruption of "sit." The context rather points in this direction, as well as the parallel in Sang.

There is evidence on independent grounds that Sang. has also been compared with the Greek at certain points; and this may explain some of the variations in the last few examples—variations difficult of explanation solely on the ground of contamination from the Vulgate.

- 3:2 Colb. omnibus regibus & ducibus & praepositis
 Vulg. omnibus purpuratis & praetoribus
 Sang. omnibus regalibus satrapis & ducibus & praepositis
 locorum & praefectis omnibus
 consulibus & praefectis
 locorum, consulibus & praefectis omnibus

The above example shows not only unmistakable evidence of conflation from the Vulgate, but also, apparently, comparison with some Greek text; for "satrapis" seems to have been suggested by the Greek word *σατράπαις*.

- 4:9 Colb. si autem dixerit, concidite, concidunt; et si dixerit
 Vulg. dixerit, excidite, excidunt; dixerit,
 Sang. si autem dixerit, excidite, excidunt; et dixerit,
 novellate, novellant.
 plantate, plantant.
 plantate, plantant.

- 4:63 Colb. et cymbalis percutiebant cum musicis
 Vulg. et exsultaverunt cum musicis
 Sang. et exsultaverunt cum cymbalis et cum musicis percutiebant

Other passages which show similar phenomena are 1:14(15), 1:16, 1:18, and 4:7-8.

2. *The Sangermanensis Text Possibly Compared with the Greek*

As intimated in the preceding, the Sangermanensis has perhaps been compared at some points with the Greek. Instances were noted where certain variations and coincidences might well be so explained.

In the following a few more cases are adduced that appear to point in the same direction. It is not urged that the evidence is by any means conclusive; but the possibility seems worthy of note. These are passages in which the differences of Sangermanensis from both Colbertinus and Vulgate find their explanation in a glance at the Greek original. We should bear in mind at the same time that the

Sangermanensis for the most part agrees with the Colbertinus verbatim. The variations are therefore the more significant.

1:8 Colb.	principes templi Dei sacerdotibus dederunt
cod. 108	ἄρχοντες οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῖς ἱερέσιν, καὶ ἔδωκαν
Gk AB, etc.	οἱ ἐπιστάται τοῦ ἱερῶν εἰς
Vulg.	* * sacerdotibus
Sang.	praepositi domus (de ipsis) sacerdotibus
	ad Pascha ovium duo millia DCC, vitulos DC.
	πάσχα πρόβατα δισχίλια ἑξακόσια [καὶ] μόσχους τριακοσίους
	in Pascha oves numero duo millia ac vituli centum
	in Pascha oves duo millia sexcentos, vitulos trecentos.

In the first part of the above, cod. 108 has preserved the reading of Colb., but not in the second half. The readings *οἴκου* of cod. 108 and *ἱεροῦ* of A, B, etc., for which Colb. has "templi" and Sang. "domus," appear to have been transposed. But the true explanation is probably that the *οἴκου* reading has been lost from the present A, B, group, but has been retained by cod. 108, and is suggested by Sang. in its "domus."

The section denoted by the asterisks is lacking in the Vulg. It appears to be a case of accidental omission through similarity of expressions. If so it is reasonably certain that "praepositi domus," with the omission of "dederunt" by Sang., resulted directly from a comparison with Gk A, B, etc. This conjecture is further supported by the fact that the numerals also do not agree either with Colb. or Vulg. but do conform exactly with the Greek.

The origin of "de ipsis" of Sang. is not so easy to explain; but may possibly be a corrupt expansion of "Dei" of Colb.

1:9b Colb.	praefecti initia dederunt Levitis ad Pascha
Gk AB, etc.	χιλιάρχοι ἔδωκαν τοῖς Λευítais εἰς πάσχα
Vulg.	* * in Phase
Sang.	tribuni dederunt Levitis in Pascha
	vitulos quingentos.
	μόσχους ἑπτακοσίους
	vitulos quingentos.
	vitulos septingentos.

This case is very similar to the preceding. Part of a line is omitted by Vulg. (**), and yet appears in Sang. Unless we assume that

Vulg. originally had this line, and that Sang. was corrected from Vulg. at an early date, we are rather shut up to the conclusion that an uncertain portion in the Sang. MS was restored by a reference to the Greek. The differences in the numerals again afford a slight support to this latter view.

1:11, 12 Colb.	et immolaverunt vitulos.
cod. 108	καὶ ἔθυσαν τοὺς μόσχους, καὶ οὐ. τ.
Gk AB, etc.	καὶ οὕτως τὸ πρωινόν· καὶ ὥπτησαν τὸ πᾶσχα
Vulg.	et assaverunt Phase.
Sang.	et sic ad diluculum et assaverunt Phase.

This passage occurs at the end of a section where cod. 108 is extremely conflated, and this fact probably explains the inverted order, as well as the absence of an exact equivalent for *καὶ οὕτως τὸ πρωινόν* in both Colb. and Vulg. Apparently it was not in the Gk original from which either of these versions was made, but appears in the AB groups, and from these possibly came the conflation in the L recension. Ultimately the variation resulted from reading *בָּקָר* as *בָּקָר*.

Now in the above cod. 108 attests the reading of Colb. beyond the possibility of a doubt, and it is reasonable to suppose that Sang. originally read like the Colb.; but perhaps observing that this did not at all agree with the Vulg. reading, the redactor may have referred to the Greek as the final deciding factor.

2:6 Colb.	adjuvent eum et dent animum Domino in loco ejus.
Vulg.	adjuvent eos qui sunt in loco ipso.
Sang.	adjuvent eum qui sunt in loco ipsius
Gk AB, etc.	βοηθείτωσαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ αὐτοῦ

At first glance it might appear that Vulg. and Sang. are in simple agreement, and that the slight differences are quite accidental. But a more careful study of the Greek does not bear out this inference. For "et dent animum Domino" of Colb. is attested by *καὶ προθυμείσθωσαν τῷ Κυρίῳ* of cod. 108, and Vulg. has descended from a Gk that omitted this phrase. Again we may suppose that the editor of Sang. noticed the variation of the Old Latin, and once more referred to the Gk to decide the case. There he discovered—supposedly—that there was no authority for the tradition of the Colb. and also that "qui" referred to the subject of "adjuvent" instead of its

object. That the Vulgate did, however, enter into the problem is indicated by the word "ipsius" of Sang., which is half-way between "ejus" of Colb. and "ipso" of Vulg. The plural, of course, could not stand in the light of *αὐτῶ* of Gk A, B, etc., and so Sang. retains "eum."

3:2 Gk *σατράπαις*
Colb. *regibus**
Vulg. *purpuratis*
Sang. *regalibus satrapis*

Here is a reasonably certain instance of direct comparison with the Greek. The O. L. translation of *σατράπαις* ("regulis," as we know from other passages, e.g., 3:14; 4:47; 4:49 and, by mistake, at the end of 3:2) became early corrupted to "regibus." The Sang. editor saw that "regibus" was a mistake, but did not recognize that the original reading was "regulis." The Vulg. "purpuratis" did not satisfy him; but referring to the Greek, he transliterates *σατράπαις* and changes "regibus" into an adjective, "regalibus."

A similar example of conflation by comparison with the Greek is found in 4:8. Nearly all of 4:7-8 is missing from Colb., but appears in Vulg. and in Sang.—apparently added by Sang. from the Vulgate. In 4:8 Vulg. has "dixerit: exterminate, exterminant," a plain translation of the Gk *εἶπεν, ἐρημῶσαι, ἐρημοῦσιν*. This Colb. omits. Sang. has, however, "dicit: exterminate, exterminabunt," as if from Vulg.; then adds a double rendering of the Gk in "desolate, et desolant." That this is also a conscious second rendering is indicated by the fact that, although in every other instance the phrases like "exterminate, exterminabunt" are prefixed by "dicit" or "dixerit," here "desolate, et desolant" has no such introductory word, but is joined directly to "exterminabunt," as if to define the Vulgate translation more correctly.

One further observation should be made: that all the above "corrections" from the Greek are from the AB type of text, and not from L.

III. THE WITNESS OF THE GREEK TEXTS

A few comments in regard to the Greek recensions seem advisable at this point. Little need be said regarding the two well-known families A and B. I would merely call attention once more to the

fact that B has usually been accepted as the better preserved text, and that the evidently superior readings of A at certain points have been explained on the basis of an assumed recension from the Hebrew. In his article "The Apparatus for the Textual Criticism of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah," in the Harper Memorial Volume of *Old Testament and Semitic Studies*, Professor C. C. Torrey has shown the real superiority of the A-manuscripts to those of the B-group. His demonstration receives additional confirmation—were any needed—in the witness of the Old Latin and the Vulgate. There are certainly the strongest reasons for regarding A as much superior to B. It is not the purpose of this article to deal with this problem, however; and so I shall enter it only so far as to show how the Latin versions support this general conclusion. This will appear later in the discussion.

It is necessary to devote considerably more space to the problem of the L recension, however, inasmuch as this peculiar Greek type enters so largely into the solution of our especial problem—the Old Latin—and is moreover a text that is so easily misused. It seems desirable to introduce at this point some further illustration of the peculiarities of the L recension, by way of supplementing those given by Professor Torrey in his article.

The L recension represents no one family of the Greek tradition. This is important to note. It is on the contrary made up from several separate sources of the Greek tradition, and has besides been compared—at least in places—with the Hebrew. The above conclusions have been established beyond the shadow of a doubt; and it has also been possible to prove that L contains many examples of "improvements" of the text, and that it is largely eclectic.

First of all, L is conflate. A very few examples will suffice for illustration.

1:3 Gk AB ἐν τῇ θέσει τῆς ἀγίας κιβωτοῦ

Gk L ἐν τῇ θέσει τῆς ἀγίας κιβωτοῦ, καὶ ἔθηκαν τὴν ἀγίαν κιβωτόν.

That the plus of L is no accident, but represents a genuine conflate reading, is shown by the fact that AB is accurately translated by the Vulgate, in "positione sanctae arcae," while Colb. has rendered the second member of L only, "et posuerunt arcam sanctam."

Clearly Colb. is from a Greek text which read as did this second member of L, and this variant tradition the author of L had before him, as well as the current AB tradition.

1:5/6: At the end of vs. 5 AB reads ἐν τάξει simply. The O.L. has "et pars domus cognationis Levitis et," = καὶ μέρος οἴκου πατρίας τοῖς Λευítais καὶ of another source. L has combined the two, reading καὶ μέρος οἴκου πατρίας τοῖς Λευítais ἐν τάξει· καί.

Probably the best illustration of all occurs in 1:10-11. Here L repeats a long section almost *in toto*. I indicate the parts as La and Lb respectively. The Vulgate follows Lb (= Gk AB).

Colb. et directa est servitus. et statuerunt sacerdotes et

La καὶ κατωρθώθη ἡ λειτουργία· καὶ ἔστησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ

AB καὶ ταῦτα τὰ γινόμενα εὐπρεπῶς, ἔστησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ

Levitae in stationibus suis, et habebant azyma

οἱ Λευῖται ἐπὶ τὴν στάσιν αὐτῶν· καὶ [

οἱ Λευῖται ἔχοντες τὰ ἄζυμα

secundum constitutionem ad dividendum ea (populo)

] ἐπὶ τὰς διαρέσεις αὐτῶν

κατὰ τὰς φυλάς καὶ κατὰ τὰς μεριδαρχίας [

secundum praecepta regis. et immolaverunt Pascha et

κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἔθυσαν τὸ φασεχ· καὶ

[

effuderunt sacerdotes sanguinem manibus suis, et

προσέχεον οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῶν, καὶ

[

immolaverunt holocausta, et sic tradiderunt

ἔθυσαν τὴν ὀλοκαύτωςιν, καὶ ἔδειραν καὶ ἡτοίμασιν παραδοῦναι

[

eis secundum divisionem cognationum, ut offerrent coram

αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν διαίρεσιν κατ' οἴκους πατριῶν τοῖς υἱοῖς

] τῶν πατέρων ἔμπροσθεν

populo

Domini, sicut scriptum est in

τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ προσαγαγεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ ὡς γέγραπται ἐν

τοῦ λαοῦ, προσενεγκεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν

libro Moysi.

βιβλίῳ Μωυσῆ·

βιβλίῳ Μωυσῆ

Lb καὶ ταῦτα τὰ γενόμενα· εὐπρεπῶς ἔστησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ
οἱ Λευῖται ἔχοντες τὰ ἄζυμα
κατὰ τὰς φυλάς κατὰ τὰς διαρέσεις [
[
[
τῶν πατριῶν ἔμπροσθεν
τοῦ λαοῦ, προσενεγκεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν
βιβλίῳ Μωυσῆ

It is obvious, from this comparison, that two divergent traditions of the passage have been taken over bodily by L, and placed side by side.

But the above illustrates not merely the tendency of L to conflation, but is a good example of certain other characteristics. For instance, there is one almost certain instance of comparison with the Hebrew. This occurs in *La*, which has τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ where Colb. has "coram populo" and AB and Lb have ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ λαοῦ. Vulg. has "in conspectu populi." It is evident that the Greek originally read ἔμπροσθεν from Hebr. לְפָנַי, and that *La* has been corrected from our canonical Hebr., which has לְבָנַי.

Of somewhat uncertain significance is the omission in *La* of any parallel for "habebant azyma secundum constitutionem" of Colb. This may be due to simple oversight, or to conflation from an inferior text, or it may be intentional because of the ἔχοντες τὰ ἄζυμα κατὰ τὰς φυλάς in Lb. Either of these explanations would fit the situation, and would also be quite in keeping with the character of L.

Another characteristic of L is its eclectic nature. While having before him, as we have seen from the above, two variant Greek traditions, the *usual* method of its author is to select from one or the other as suits his fancy, rather than to conflate the two. For this reason we sometimes find L following A, sometimes B, and again following the otherwise unknown readings of a peculiar source. (I should perhaps remark that as between A and B, L follows A rather closely as a rule, and only rarely agrees with B against A.)

Finally, L has certainly been compared with the Hebrew in certain places. As to the degree of comparison, there seems to be a difference of testimony among the various codices included in the L group: yet they agree in the main. The chief points of direct contact with the Hebrew are in the sections dealing with the lists of proper names.

I shall give only a few examples, inasmuch as the same phenomenon appears throughout I Esdras. The Hebrew with which L has been compared is quite similar to our canonical Hebrew text, and yet appears to have differed slightly at certain points. Which was the better text is not our purpose at present to determine.

8:43(45) AB, Ἰδουήλων] Colb., "Idouelon." But L Ἀριηλ, from Hebrew אֲרִיֶּאֵל. For the rest of the verse L omits *Maià, Μασμάν*, which do not appear in the Hebrew, and also Ἰώριβον and a second Ἐλναθάν (appearing in AB as Ἐννατάν), which are in the Hebrew, but which were probably overlooked because the Hebrew read וְלֹאֲלֵנָתָן וְלִירִיב, and the eye of the redactor jumped from the first וְלֹאֲלֵנָתָן to the second; or else—more probably—because these two words were not in the Hebrew which the author of L had before him.

8:32(35) Ζαθός] L omits, following the Hebrew.

8:34(37) Ζαραίας] cod. 108 has Ζαβδεις, from Hebrew זְבַדְיָה.

8:44(46), 45(47) Λοδδαῖον] L = Ἀδδαι; Hebrew אָדָּי.

8:47(49) Χανονναῖον] L = Μεραρει; from Hebrew מְרַרִי.

9:14 Θεοκανον] L = Θεκουε; Hebrew תִּקְרָה.

9:22 Ωκοδηλος] cod. 108 = Ἰωζαβαδ; Hebrew יִזְבֵּד.

Ταλσας (Σαλοας) cod. 108 = Ηλασα; Hebrew אֶלְעָשָׂה.

9:23 Ιωνας] L = Ελιεζερ; Hebrew אֶלִיעֶזֶר.

9:25 Τολβανης Τολμανης] L = Τελλημ καὶ Ουριας; Hebrew טָלֵם וְאוּרִי.

9:27 Ιεζριηλος Ιεζορικλος] cod. 108 = Ιειηλ; Hebrew יְדִיֶּאֵל.

9:28 Ελιωδας] cod. 108 = Ελιωναι; Hebrew אֶלִיּוּעִי.

Οθονιас] cod. 108 = Μαθανια; Hebrew מִתְנִיָּה.

Ζαβαδεις καὶ Ζαρδιас) Σαβαθος Ζεραλιас] cod. 108 = Ζαβαδοζει; from Hebrew זְבַדְעִזְיָה.

9:29 Ιωζαβδος καὶ Εμαθι Ζαβδος κ Ε.] L = Ζαββουθ Θελεει; from Hebrew זְבִי עֲתָלִי.

9:31 Αδδιν Λαθος Αδδι Νααθος] cod. 19 = Μωαβ Αιανα; cod. 108 = Φαθμωαβ Αιανα; Hebrew פָּתַח מִוָּאֵב עֲדָנָא.

9:33 Βανναιους Σαβανναιους] L = Ζαβδαι; Hebrew זָבַד. L further adds Ιερεμει, Hebrew יִרְמְיָ, but found in no other Greek text or version.

These examples are characteristic ones, and it would be a needless waste of time to multiply instances. Throughout the sections where proper names appear it will be found that L agrees for the most part very closely indeed with the Massoretic text. I have selected only those names which in AB have departed most widely from our

present Hebrew, and whose L variant finds no support in any version. It will be found that L with few exceptions conforms throughout to the consonants of M, even to the extent of omitting the usual ending *-os*, e.g., *Μεσολλαμ* for *Μοσολλαμος* (9:14) and *Ασσαηλ* for *Αζαηλου* (9:14).

Other indications of comparison with the Hebrew are the several instances of the addition of *νίος* where it has apparently crept in in the Massoretic text; i.e., where there is no support, beyond the evident meaning, in any other Greek text.

The exact explanation of *ναθιναῖοι* of L (Hebrew נְתִינִים) in the place of *ιερόδουλοι* of AB, or of *πέσαχ* for *πάσχα* may not be quite certain, but it at least points to a transliteration from the Hebrew at some stage of the history of L.

Reverting once more for a moment to that fruitful passage 1:10–11, let me point out that we have strong evidence that AB suffered some early permanent corruption. This fact is important as bearing on our later conclusions. In the first place AB omits a considerable section contained in *La*—the original reading preserved thus by L only—between *διαίρέσεις* and *διαίρεσιν*. But this omitted section is independently attested by the Old Latin, and is of such a character that its omission by AB is unquestionably accidental. On the other hand, that this omission took place early is shown by the absence of this phrase in the Vulgate and also by the fact that the author of L did not have it in his AB text. But this conclusion involves another point: Our present AB text has *μεριδαρχίας* in the place of *La*'s *διαίρέσεις*. This would not be so remarkable, for we might readily conjecture a second *μεριδαρχίας* or *μεριδαρχίαν* in the original of AB to correspond with the second *διαίρεσιν* of *La*, were it not for the fact that *Lb*—which elsewhere has copied AB verbatim—has here *διαίρέσεις*. In the light of these evidences it seems to me practically certain that AB also originally read as does *Lb*; in other words, that AB has undergone some slight corruption since the L conflation took place.

The above receives additional confirmation from certain other passages which will be noted later in another connection. It becomes important when we come to consider the problem of certain divergences of the Old Latin and Vulgate from any extant Greek reading.

It at least opens the possibility that our Latin versions may preserve better readings in places than even the Greek. For it should be further noted that after the first few verses of I Esdras the compiler of L shows less of the tendency to conflate, and prefers to select from AB, or from the source which had the original reading, as suits his fancy. For this reason many old readings have certainly been lost to us, at least so far as the Greek is concerned.

IV. THE OLD LATIN

As previously stated, the Old Latin is chiefly represented by two manuscripts, the Colbertinus and the Sangermanensis.⁸ We have already discussed Sang., and there yet remain the characteristics of Colb. to be studied.

The Colbertinus manuscript dates from about 800 A.D., approximately a century earlier than the Sangermanensis. This in itself might suggest a slight possibility of superiority in the former, though not necessarily so. But we have seen that the Sangermanensis represents an "emended" Old Latin text—one that has suffered through editorial revision—so that we are left practically dependent on the Colbertinus alone in the final analysis. The Sangermanensis is of independent value only at a few points and in minor particulars.

The date of this Old Latin version is far from fixed. References to Latin translations of the Bible, or parts of it, go back to the middle of the third century A.D., and even earlier; but whether or not these included the original of the Colb. and Sang. texts for the book of I Esdras cannot be asserted positively. Augustine, early in the fifth century, certainly knows this Old Latin version which we have; for in his *De divinis scripturis sive speculum* he says: "Item in libro hesdrae I: 'Veritas autem permanet et invalescit in aeternum et vivet et perseverat in saecula saeculorum, et non accipit personam hominis nec differentias, sed iusta iudicat et facit: ab omnibus iniquis dolosis et impiis discedit, et omnes iusti sperant in eam, et

⁸ [Since the above was written, Mr. York has studied and collated the Cod. Mazari-naeus (M) in the Mazarine Library at Paris, and the Cod. Ambianensis (A) in the Bibliothèque Municipale at Amiens (see Bensly in the *Cambridge Texts and Studies*, III, 2, xlii). He reports that M, which contains of I Esdr. only 3: 1-5: 3, is a MS of the same type as Sang., with which it agrees very closely. A, on the other hand, is a Vulg. MS which only rarely departs from the received text. Neither cod. contains material of importance for the present discussion.—ED.]

non est in iudicio illius iniustitia: et eius est fortitudo et regnum et potestas illius in saecula saeculorum, benedictus est enim dominus veritatis.'” This is unquestionably a quotation from the Old Latin of I Esdras 4:38–40, with a free admixture of the Vulgate version as well, together with an occasional addition for the sake of “improvement” by Augustine himself. In the absence of more decisive data, therefore, the exact date of the Old Latin must remain a matter of conjecture and of internal evidence.

Characteristics of the Old Latin Version

Most noticeable among the peculiarities of the Old Latin translator is his freedom in rendering the Greek. Not only is he very free in his constructions, but he is also given to paraphrases and interpretations in his renderings, not hesitating to add words or even whole phrases if he thinks the sense is improved by such treatment. Of course, this propensity on his part becomes very annoying at times when we wish to determine the exact wording of the Greek that he had before him, but usually we are left in no doubt, thanks to the aid of what Greek we have.

There are further indications that this translator was somewhat careless, and has made seemingly stupid translations, or has omitted needful words or phrases in a way for which there is no apparent excuse. But in spite of these defects, or sometimes just because of them, we are able to reconstruct the Greek original of this Old Latin with tolerable certainty.

To give a fair idea of the above-mentioned characteristics I will bring forward a few examples:

- 1:4 *αὐτῶν* of all Gk (Vulg. “eam”) is rendered “*arcam*” by Colb.
 1:6 Colb. adds “*secundum constitutionem*” to its rendering of *θύσατε τὸ πᾶσχα*, and this is almost certainly a free expansion. *δοθέν τῷ Μωϋσῇ* is found in all Gk cods., and would be closely translated “datum est Moysi”; but Colb. has “data est *per manum* Moysi” (Compare, however, II Chron. 35:6).
 1:21(23) Colb. defines “Josiae” by “*regis*,” which has no support in Greek or Vulgate, and is doubtless added by the translator. Similar unauthorized additions of some form of “rex” are found in 1:23(25) twice; in 1:30(32); 1:36(38); 1:43(45); 3:14; 3:15(16); 4:31; 4:58; 6:17(18); 6:18(19); 8:64(68).

Closely allied to the above type of expansion is the addition of

- "populus," especially to "Israel"; e.g., in 1:30(32); 1:31(33); 7:8; 8:81(85); 8:88(92); 8:91(96); 9:2.
- 1:53(56) τοὺς ἐπιλοίπους Colb. really translates twice in "reliquos qui remanserunt."
- 1:54(57) εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν Colb. renders by a subordinate clause "ut impleret" (for "ut impleretur," evidently. Cf. 2:1).
- 2:3 βασιλείᾳ τῆς οἰκουμένης is paraphrased by Colb. "regem universae terrae Persarum."
- 2:9(10) Colb. adds at end of the verse "et adtulerunt in Babylone," apparently an explanatory gloss, since it is quite without textual support.
- 2:23(27) Colb. adds "civitatis illius" to its rendering of οἱ ἄνθρωποι, also without support.
- 2:30(31) ἤρξαντο κωλύειν is rendered by Colb. "continuo ut venerunt prohibuerunt."
- 3:6 Colb. inserts "dabit ei" twice, apparently with the intention of rendering the meaning less ambiguous.
- 3:13 Colb. interprets αὐτῷ by "regi."
- 3:17 ὁ εἶπας περὶ τῆς ἰσχύος τοῦ οἴνου. Colb. changes the construction of this completely, and has "qui scripserat, fortius est vinum."
- 4:2 Colb. appends "obediunt ei," apparently as an interpretative improvement.
- 4:11 τηροῦσιν Colb. renders "vigilant et servant," a double translation. οἷδὲ παρακούουσιν αὐτοῦ is paraphrased by the Old Latin "nec potest aliquis negligere mandata ejus."
- 4:28 Another double translation appears in the rendering "timent et verentur" for εἰλαβοῦνται.
- Other noticeable examples of double translation occur in 1:14(15) "et psalmos percutiebant" + "et psalmos decantabant"; 5:61(64) "gaudia magna ingenti et magna voce" for χαρὰ μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ; cf. also 2:5*bc* and 6:9(10) δόξῃ.

Frequently pronouns in the Greek are rendered by nouns in the Old Latin, the translator taking the liberty to supply what he conceived to be the antecedent. Sometimes this freedom was warranted by the nature of the situation—e.g., when an αὐτῷ or αὐτῇ would have to be rendered indiscriminately "ei" in the Latin—but oftener it has no such excuse. Thus in 4:31 αὐτῷ . . . αὐτὸν . . . αὐτῇ are interpreted by Colb. "contra regem + et ipse" . . . "regem" . . . "regi," respectively. There is some reason for the change here; for in the Latin there might be a question as to which was subject and which object, whether the king or his παλλακή. But

why it should be thought necessary to interpret *ἐξ αὐτῶν* "ex mulieribus" (4:16), or *αὐτοῦ* by "Darii" (5:6), or *αὐτοῖς* by "Judaeis" (6:4) is not so plain; for in each of these cases the meaning is perfectly clear.

Three times the name of Zorobabel is introduced in the Old Latin where there is no support in the Greek or in other versions, viz., in 4:33, 4:43, and 4:58. In the last-named passage, indeed, it takes the place of *ὁ νεανίσκος*.

Once, at least, (6:12/13) Colb. has expanded a familiar phrase "Domini, qui fecit coelum et terram" to its full form by the addition of "et mare et omnia quae in eis sunt," as found in 4:2. Compare Neh. 9:6, Exod. 20:11, and Ps. 146:6. Probably also the lists of officers in 3:2 and 4:49 have been expanded from similar lists in 3:14; 4:47 (Dan. 3:2).

Similar phenomena occur in 8:16 (17) and 8:17(19), which exhibit a remarkable interdependence. In 8:16(17) *πάντα ὅσα ἐὰν* is rendered "omnia reliqua quae sunt necessaria" by Colb., *λοιπὰ* and *ὑποπίπτῃ* having been supplied from 8:17(19); while in 8:17(19) *τὰ λοιπὰ ὅσα ἐὰν ὑποπίπτῃ* is likewise rendered "omnia reliqua quae sunt neces saria," the Old Latin completing the phrase from *πάντα* of 8:16(17).

A trace of theological apologetics may be the basis of the rendering "ergo digne irasceris" for *ὀργίσθης* in 8:85(89).

One other striking example of an interpretative rendering by the Old Latin is in 8:87(91), where Colb. in the phrase *οὐ γὰρ ἔστι στήναι ἔτι ἔμπροσθέν σου ἐπὶ τούτοις* has rendered *ἐπὶ τούτοις* by "obrupti talibus peccatis," simply because this phrase very clearly refers to *ἐσμὲν ἐνώπιόν σου ἐν ταῖς ἀνομίαις ἡμῶν* immediately preceding.

A further fault of the Old Latin is its liability to omit words or phrases. Some of these omissions are probably due to corresponding omissions in the Greek text that the translator had before him, and many others are unquestionably the result of subsequent corruption in the Latin; but not all can be so explained. A considerable number of instances are still left, when all possible excuses have been made, that can only be regarded as due to careless oversight. Following are some characteristic cases:

- 1:3 τοῖς ἱεροδοούλοις Ἰσραήλ, descriptive of τοῖς Λευítais, is omitted by Colb. only. Its presence in Sang. is probably to be explained on the ground of conflation from the Vulgate or of correction from the Greek.
- 1:4 θεραπεύετε is in all Gk cods., and is rendered by Vulg. "curam agite"; but Colb. omits.
- 1:11(12) ἐν πυρί Colb. alone omits.
- 1:31(33) ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ νῦν, ἱστόρηται is in all codices and in the Vulgate, but Old Latin omits. Here the context rather demands at least ἱστόρηται.
- 1:33(35); 1:47(49) ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ Colb. seems to have ignored the ἐν in its translation.
- Similarly in 2:18(21) in rendering ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων σου βιβλίοις Colb. lacks a very needful "in libris" between "inspicias" and "patrum tuorum."
- 5:11 υἱοὶ Φααθμωαβ εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰησοῦ. Colb. omits τοὺς υἱούς, and joins εἰς to what precedes, making "Phammoabis Jesu." This, however, is probably the result of an inferior Greek text.
- 6:4 Colb. omits καὶ τὴν στέγην ταύτην, found in all Greek codices and in the Vulgate.
- 6:6-7 Colb. leaves out about half a verse, evidently by accident because of the occurrence of Δαρίω twice, a case of homoioteleuton.
- A similar omission of εἰς τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἐλθόντες occurs in 6:8.

There are a large number of these omissions on the part of the Old Latin scattered throughout I Esdras.

Additional light is thrown on this question by a different type of error. For instance, in 2:3 Colb. has "Dominus," having read *Kûpos* as *Kýrios*. Again, in 8:46(48) Colb. reads "viros peritos de viros," where both Greek and sense demand "viros peritos de filiis." The second "viros" in Colb. is evidently a careless repetition from the first "viros."

Unquestionably, therefore, the Old Latin is far from being an infallible witness. Partly because of the character of the translator, and in still larger measure because of faulty textual transmission, it is evident that we must use this source also with the greatest caution and view its unsupported readings with the utmost suspicion.

V. THE VULGATE

This is the common Latin version. First Esdras in this version bears the distinction of being one of three books assigned a secondary place in the Old Testament canon by the Roman Catholic church.

As to its date, we can place it definitely as early as the time of Cyprian, about 250 A.D. In chap. 9 of Epistle LXXIV, a letter addressed to Pompey in opposition to the position of Stephen of Rome on the subject of the baptism of heretics, he says: "veritas manet et invalescit in aeternum et vivit et optinet in saecula saeculorum. nec est apud eam accipere personam nec differentias, sed quae sunt justa facit, nec est iudicio ejus iniquum, et fortitudo et regnum et majestas et potestas omnium saeculorum. benedictus Deus veritatis." This is an almost verbatim quotation from the Vulgate of I Esdras 4:38-40, with the exception that Cyprian omits a line after "sed quae sunt justa facit." (The Old Latin differs quite widely, so that it is out of the question that this is what Cyprian had.) Probably, therefore, the Vulgate translation was made some time in the first half of the third century A.D.

VI. RELATION OF THE VULGATE TO THE OLD LATIN

Many questions at once arise in this connection, especially in regard to the possibility that these may either be independent translations or divergent streams from a single Latin original. The usual assumption appears to be voiced by two brief allusions in recent critical articles. One is by H. A. A. Kennedy in his article on "Latin Versions" in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*; referring to I Esdras he says: "Probably, the Vulgate is an emended form of the other [i.e., the Old Latin] version." The other is by F. C. Burkitt in his article on "Text and Versions" in the *Encyclopedia Biblica* (§ 38): "The Old Testament 'Apocrypha'—i.e., those books of the Greek Old Testament which are not in the Hebrew canon—were left more or less untouched by Jerome; *in these books, therefore, the Old Latin survives in the Vulgate.*" I cannot answer for the other apocryphal books, but in the case of I Esdras I must wonder on what evidence this conclusion is based. In one sense Burkitt is right, viz., that the Vulgate is a very old Latin translation, but not in the sense that his words seem to imply; for undefined, his assertion regarding "*the Old Latin*" can hardly mean otherwise than that of Kennedy, that "the Vulgate is an emended form of the other version," namely, of the one now surviving in the Codex Colbertinus. With this position I must take positive issue. I do not find the

slightest indication of an "emended" text in the Vulgate, nor scarcely knowledge of the Old Latin on the part of the Vulgate translator. The evidence bearing on these points will be presented in the following pages.

1. *The Old Latin and the Vulgate Independent Translations*

In the first place, of the 450 verses of I Esdras there are just two verses that are exactly alike in both Colbertinus and the Vulgate. This does not, to be sure, take into account a considerable number of verses whose divergence is very slight and trifling, such as might easily be accounted for on the basis of textual transmission. Allowing a liberal margin for these, we still have a large residue of verses so different in language and idiom that it is impossible to believe that they are other than separate translations. Even in those sections where we are most certain that the two versions go back to an identical Greek original this difference of idiom is as marked as one could wish.

The traits of the two translators are likewise distinctive. The Vulgate is literal, to a fault; the Old Latin is free—also to a fault. The former hesitates to paraphrase to avoid an ambiguity; the latter paraphrases even when there is no ambiguity. The vocabulary employed by the two translators is also distinctive. For example, the Old Latin has the preposition "de" universally in places where the Vulgate employs "ex"; the conjunction "quia" in the Old Latin is equivalent to "quoniam" in the Vulgate; "is" in the Old Latin corresponds to "ille" or "ipse" of the Vulgate; "facio" of the Old Latin is usually rendered "ago" by the Vulgate; and "sanctus" of the Old Latin is likely to appear as "sacer" in the Vulgate. Other similar differences of vocabulary there are, but these are the most common. It seems the extreme of improbability that one who was simply "emending" the Old Latin should have taken the trouble to change at the same time the whole vocabulary, especially in such a minor particular as "de" to "ex," or "is" to "ille."

But we will take some particular examples. In the following, care has been used to select passages where the Greek is best attested as well as where there is least suspicion of corruption in the Latin

itself. These are by no means isolated or unusual cases, but such as can be duplicated almost at random.

1:4 οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῖν ἀραι αὐτὴν ἐπ' ὤμων

O.L. non portabitis arcam in humeris.

Vulg. non erit vobis tollere super humeros eam.

(Here "arcam" of the Old Latin is probably interpretative, though possibly a corruption of "eam.")

1:22(24) τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν δὲ ἀναγράφεται ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις

O.L. actus ejus quidem conscriptus est, de his qui ante

Vulg. quae circa illum conscripta sunt, in pristinis temporibus

περὶ τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων καὶ ἡσεβηκότων εἰς τὸν Κύριον

peccaverunt in Domino sceleratius

de his qui peccaverunt quique irreligiosi fuerunt in Dominum

παρὰ πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ βασιλείαν

quam universae gentes

prae omni gente

1:29(31) ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρμα αὐτοῦ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἀποσταθεὶς εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ

O.L. in currum ejus secundum, et deductus venit in Hierusalem

Vulg. super currum secundarium suum, et perveniens Jerosolymam

1:52 ἕως οὗ θυμωθέντα αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ἔθνει αὐτοῦ

O.L. "donec in ira exardesceret adversus gentem suam

Vulg. "qui usque ad iracundiam concitatus est super gentem suam

διὰ τὰ δυσσεβήματα αὐτῶν

propter impietates eorum."

propter irreligiositatem suam."

1:56 καὶ συνετέλεσαν πάντα τὰ ἐνδοξα αὐτῆς ἀχρεῖωσαι

O.L. "et diruere omnia praeclara ejus evertentes,

Vulg. "et consummaverunt omnia honorifica ejus, ad nihilum

καὶ τοὺς ἐπιλοίπους

& reliquos qui remanserunt"

redegerunt, & reliquos

"

2:20 ἐπεὶ ἐνεργεῖται τὰ κατὰ τὸν ναὸν, καλῶς ἔχιν ὑπολαμβάνομεν μὴ

O.L. "quia instatur opera templi, aestimavimus bonum esse

Vulg. "quia id agitur circa templum, recte habere arbitrari sumus.

ὑπεριδεῖν τὸ τοιοῦτο

non omittere

non despicere hoc ipsum"

- 2:29 *μὴ προβῇ ἐπὶ πλείον τὰ τῆς κακιᾶς εἰς τὸ*
 O.L. "non proficiat amplius malitiae occasio
 Vulg. "nec procedunt in plurimum ea, quae sunt malitiae,
 βασιλεῖς ἐνοχλείσθαι
 ad commovendos reges"
 ita ut regibus molestia importetur"
- 8:86 *οὐ ζητήσετε εἰρηνεῦσαι τὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἵνα*
 O.L. "non desiderabitis declinare ad eos cum pace omni tempore ut
 Vulg. "non inquiretis pacem habere cum illis omni tempore ut
 ισχύσαντες φάγετε τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς· καὶ κληρονομήσητε
 confortati manducetis optima terrae & haeredes
 invalescentes manducetis optima terrae & haereditatem
 τοῖς υἱοῖς ὑμῶν ἕως αἰῶνος
 facietis filios vestros usque in aeternum"
 distribuatis filiis vestris usque in aevum"
- 8:90(91) *οὐ γὰρ ἐστι στήναι ἔτι ἔμπροσθέν σου ἐπὶ τούτοις*
 O.L. "non enim possumus stare adhuc ante faciem tuam
 Vulg. "non est adhuc stare ante te
 obrutis talibus peccatis
 in his
 (This last example is also a good illustration of the Old
 Latin's habit of free paraphrasing.)
- 9:4 *καὶ ὅσοι ἐὰν μὴ ἀπαντήσωσιν ἐν δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν ἡμέραις*
 O.L. "et quotquot non convenissent secunda aut tertia
 Vulg. "ut quicumque non occurrerit biduo aut triduo
 κατὰ τὸ κρίμα τῶν προκαθημένων πρεσβυτέρων
 secundum iudicium praesentium presbyterorum
 secundum iudicium assidentium seniorum
 ἀνιερωθήσονται τὰ κτήνη αὐτῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἄλλοτριωθήσεται
 publicarentur pecora eorum & ipse hostis vocaretur
 tollerentur facultates suae & ipse alienus iudicaretur
- 9:20 *ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ ἐκβαλεῖν . . . καὶ εἰς ἐξίλασμόν*
 O.L. "immiserunt manus ut projicerent . . . et obtulerent ad
 Vulg. "injicerunt manus ut expellerent . . . et ad litandem in
 placandem
 exorationem
- 9:24 *ἐκ τῶν ἱεροψαλτῶν*
 O.L. "de sacra ornata percutientibus
 Vulg. "ex sacris cantoribus

- 9:36 πάντες οὗτοι συνῴκισαν γυναῖκας ἀλλογενεῖς καὶ ἀπέλυσαν
 O.L. "hi omnes duxerunt alienigenas uxores & relinquerunt
 Vulg. "omnes isti conjungerunt sibi uxores alienigenas & dimiserunt
- 5:73 καὶ συστάσεις ποιούμενοι ἀπεκώλυσαν τοῦ ἀποτελεσθῆναι
 O.L. "& congregationes facientes, prohibuerunt consummari
 Vulg. "& aggresuras exercentes, impedierunt ne consummaretur
 τῇν οἰκοδομῇν καὶ εἰρχθῆσαν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς ἔτη δύο
 structuram & prohibiti sunt aedificare annis duobus
 aedificium & protraxerunt structuram per biennium
- 8:12(13) ὅπως ἐπισκέψωνται τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν
 O.L. "diligenter adtendant Judaeae
 Vulg. "ut visitent ea (*quae aguntur*) secundum Judaeam
- 8:18(19) τὰ λοιπὰ ὅσα ἐὰν ὑποπίπτῃ σοι εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν
 O.L. "caetera (*omnia*) quaecunque tibi sunt necessaria ad usum
 Vulg. "caetera quaecunque tibi subvenerint ad opera
 τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ[σου], δώσεις ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γαζοφυλακίου
 templi Dei , dabuntur de thesauris regis
 templi Dei tui, dabis de regali gazophylacio
 (The above bracketed words are very doubtful. They
 are probably free expansions or interpretations.)
- 8:22(25) μηδὲ ἄλλην ἐπιβουλὴν γινέσθαι καὶ μηδένα ἔχειν
 O.L. "nec aliud onus imponatur, & nemo habeat
 Vulg. "neque ulla alia indictio irrogetur, nec habeat quisquam
 ἐξουσίαν ἐπιβαλεῖν τι τοῖτοῖς (perhaps originally αὐτοῖς)
 potestatem indicere eis aliquid
 potestatem objicere eis quidquam
- 8:24(27) κολαζέσθωσαν, ἐὰν τε θανάτῳ, ἐὰν τε τιμωρίᾳ, ἢ ἀργυρικῇ
 O.L. "punientur, sive morte, sive tormentis, sive condemnatione
 Vulg. "plectantur, sive morte, sive cruciatu, sive etiam pecuniae
 ζημίας ἢ ἀπογογῇ
 pecuniae, aut exilio.
 mulctatione, vel adductione.
- 9:38 συνήχθη τὸ πλῆθος ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ εὐρύχωρον τὸ
 O.L. "convenit populus uno animo in aream quae est
 Vulg. "congregati sunt multitudo simul in aream quae est
 πρὸς ἀνατολὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ πυλῶνος
 ad orientem portae templi
 ab oriente* portae sacrae

If there is still any doubt remaining as to the independence of these two versions, it must be dissolved when we adduce a few more examples selected from the lists of proper names. In these passages the variations could only have occurred through the two translators having divided the Greek text differently, not being certain as to the proper combinations for the strange foreign names. Thus we find curious mistakes like the following:

9:23 οὗτός ἐστι καλιτας
O.L. hic est Ele & Has
Vulg. et Calitas

In this case codices 44, 58 omit *οὗτός ἐστι*, and 108 omits *ἐστι*, so that it is possible that the translator of the Vulg. did not have before him exactly the same Greek text that the translator of the Old Latin had. If so, of course no further proof is necessary; since by virtue of such fact the two translations are bound to be independent. But assuming that they both had the same Greek text, even so the Old Latin and the Vulg. cannot be divergent versions of the same Latin translation; for the "Ele & Has" of the Old Latin can hardly have resulted otherwise than through the translator having read the Greek as *οὗτός ἐστιν ἀλι κ' ἄς*, whereas the translator of the Vulg. correctly read *καλιτας*.

5:20(19): The Greek is far from certain here, but the following conjectural reading cannot be very far from the original of both Old Latin and Vulgate. Again assuming that the Greek original of both versions was identical, we have:

οἱ [ἐν χαδιασ[αι] καὶ ἀμωδιοι οἱ [δ'] ἐκ γραμας
O.L. "qui erant in Necla bis & modius, & qui decem miras
Vulg. "qui Enocadies & Modiae, ... qui ex Gramas
γαββης οἱ ἐκ μακα[δων]
. . . . Cabbes & qui erant Demacha
& Gabea ()

The confusion in the mind of the translator as to the meaning of the Greek in this passage could hardly have been greater, or his attempts to translate proper names scarcely more absurd; yet because of this very fact it becomes the more certain that the translator of the Old Latin is not the translator of the Vulgate. Similar variations, easily explained by the aid of the Greek, are found in

5:21 and 5:36; but it is needless to multiply instances further. We might include an interesting example (8:11), where ὥρα (Hebr. עֵת) has been misread as χώρα by the Old Latin, which translates it accordingly "regio"; but the Vulgate has correctly rendered it "tempus."

(It might be observed that it is barely possible that the Old Latin had before it a Greek text which originally read χρόνος, subsequently corrupted to χώρα; but this is less likely.)

2. *The Old Latin and the Vulgate Descended from Slightly Different Greek Originals*

That the Old Latin and the Vulgate are independent translations receives additional confirmation from the evidence we have that these two versions do not come from identical Greek prototypes. The variations that are attested are not as a rule very wide ones; yet they are too many, and a considerable number of them too unmistakable, to permit of doubt on this point. For conclusive evidence as to this, the Lucian text is extremely important, for it has preserved many readings not otherwise known in the Greek texts. A number of such readings were in the Greek from which the Old Latin translation was made. On the other hand, not a few variations between the Old Latin and the Vulgate can be traced to differences of groups within the "A" line of tradition. I say "A" line of tradition, because—as we shall see later—neither the Old Latin nor the Vulgate belongs to the "B" group; and these two Latin versions, though possibly not strictly of the "A" group, do yet show far closer agreement with this branch of the Greek tradition than with the "B" group.

Following are some of the more important and unmistakable instances of the divergent tradition from which these two Latin versions were derived:

- 1:3 The Vulgate reads "in positione sanctae arcae," which corresponds literally to Gk A, B, etc., ἐν τῇ θέσει τῆς ἀγίας κιβωτοῦ, but Colb. has "et posuerunt arcam sanctam," the Gk of which is found only in a variant conflate reading of "L" (cod. 108) καὶ ἔθηκαν τὴν ἀγίαν κιβωτόν.
- 1:4 Colb. "nunc autem" is equivalent to cod. 108 νῦν οὖν; but Vulg. "et nunc" comes from Gk A, B, etc., which have καὶ νῦν.

Colb. "domus cognationum vestrarum secundum vices dierum vestrorum" is a good rendering of the Gk of cod. 108 τὸν οἶκον πατριῶν ὑμῶν κατὰ τὰς ἐφημερίας ὑμῶν. The Vulg., however, has "ex parte secundum pagos et tribus vestras," from Gk A, B, etc., κατὰ τὰς πατρίας καὶ τὰς φυλὰς ὑμῶν.

- 1:5 The Vulg. reading, "secundum magnificentiam" is an exact reproduction of Gk A, B, etc., κατὰ τὴν μεγαλειότητα, but Colb. "secundum constitutionem regis" could never have come from such a Gk text. It is rather a free translation of cod. 108, διὰ χειρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως.
- 1:5 Colb. "state" corresponds to cod. 108, στήτε; but the Vulg. "omnes" = codices 44, 71, 106, πάντες (al. στάντες).
- 1:6 Colb. has "et pars domus cognationis Levitis; et," corresponding to cod. 108, καὶ μέρος οἶκον πατρίας τοῖς Λευίταις καί; but the Vulgate and all other Gk codices omit entirely.
- 1:7(8) Colb. "de substantia regis data sunt. Et principes ejus dederunt initia" is a fairly close translation of cod. 108, [ταῦτα] ἐκ τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ βασιλέως ἐδόθη, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτοῦ ἀπήρξαντο, but the Vulg. "haec de regalibus data sunt secundum promissionem" is plainly from Gk A, etc., ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἐδόθη κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν.
- 1:11, 12(13) Colb. has "filiis populi et ex his," equivalent to cod. 108, τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν. The Vulgate has, on the other hand, "qui erant ex plebe, et post haec," = Gk A, etc., τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ · μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα.
- 1:12(14) Colb. adds "& holocausta" = cod. 108, καὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα, but all other codices agree with the Vulgate in omitting.
- 1:15(16) Colb. adds "& principes" = cod. 108, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες. Vulgate and all other codices omit.
- 1:15(16) Vulg. "per singulas januas, ita ut non prevaricaretur unusquisque suam (vicem)" can only come from Gk A, B, etc.; but the Colb. "portarum non discedebant unusquisque a servitute sua" = cod. 108, πύλης καὶ πύλης οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς κινεῖσθαι ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτῶν. AB, ἐφ' ἑκάστου πυλῶνος· οὐκ ἔστι παραβῆναι ἕκαστον τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐφημερίαν.
- 1:16(18) Colb. "ut fecerent Pascha, et offerrent holocausta" = cod. 108, τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ πάσχα καὶ ἐνεγκεῖν τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα. But Vulg. has simply "egerunt Phase" = A, B, etc., ἀχθῆναι τὸ πάσχα.
- 1:18(20) Colb. "a diebus" = 108 ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμερῶν; but Vulg. "a temporibus" corresponds to Gk A, B, etc., ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων.
- 1:29(31) Vulg. "ascendit" = Gk A, B, etc., ἀνέβη; but Colb. "imposuerunt eum" can only come from cod. 108, ἀναβίβασαν αὐτόν.
- 1:34(35) Colb. has "talanta decem" = cods. 108, 121, τάλαντα δέκα. The Vulgate, however, has "talantum unum" = Gk A, B, etc., τάλαντον ἓνα.
- 1:38(40) Colb. "adversus hunc" corresponds to ἐπ' αὐτόν of cod. N, Ald. Alex. and 8 cursives; but Vulg. has "post hunc autem," equivalent to μετ' αὐτόν δὲ of Gk A, B, and 9 cursives.

- 1:49(51) Colb. "angelos"=τοὺς ἀγγέλους of cods. 52, 64, 108, 119, 243, 248, Ald. But Vulg. "in angelis"=ἐν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις of al. cod.
- 2:6 Colb. "& dent animum Domino"=cod. 108, καὶ προθυμείσθωσαν τῷ Κυρίῳ, which Gk A, B, etc., agree with Vulg. in omitting.
- 4:53 Vulg. has "qui praecedunt"=Gk A, B, etc., τοῖς προσβαίνουσιν. But Colb. agrees with cod. 108 in omitting.
- (MS Sang. does have this; but it appears to have gotten it either from the Vulgate or directly from the Gk itself.)
- 4:55 Colb. has "dari"=δοθῆναι of cod. 108; but Vulg. "dare"=δοῦναι of all other Gk codices.
- 4:59 Colb. consilium=ἡ βουλή of cods. 108, 121; but Vulgate and all other codices omit.
- Vulg. "abs te"=Gk A, B, etc., παρὰ σου; cod. 108 and Colb. omit.
- 5:7 Vulg.="sunt autem hi," corresponding to εἰσὶ δὲ οἱτοι of Gk A, B, etc.; but Colb. and cod. 108 omit.

An unusual case is that of a reading found in the Vulgate in 1:25. Here Colb. follows the regular Greek reading πρὸς αὐτόν, translating it "ad eum." But the Vulg. has "ad Josiam," which finds support in a quotation of Theodotion in *Cat. Nic.* ii, 943, πρὸς Ἰωσίαν.

- 6:17(18) Colb. "omnia"=19, 108 πάντα; but AB has ἅπαν=Vulg. "rursus." Colb. "tradidit ea"=cod. 245, παρέδωκεν αὐτά (71 has παρέδωκε without αὐτά). Other cods. have παρεδόθη, equivalent to Vulg. "tradita sunt."
- 6:22(23) Colb. agrees with B and L in omitting εἰς after τόπος. Vulgate has "unus."
- 6:23(24) Colb. "aedificari"=L, 71, 121 οἰκοδομηθῆναι. Vulgate, however, has "aedificare," following the usual reading οἰκοδομησαι.
- 6:24(25) Colb. gives the height of the temple that was to be built as "cubitorum sexaginta," from the ordinary reading πήχων ἑξήκοντα. But Vulg. has "decem," preserved elsewhere only by cod. 106 in a marginal reading from another hand.
- 6:30(31) Colb. "hostiae"=αἱ θυσίαι of 19, 108. Vulg. has "libationes" from Gk AB, σπόνδαι.
- 7:4 At the end of this verse Colb. has "usque in sextum annum Darii regis Persarum," from ἕως τοῦ ἕκτου ἔτους Δαρίου βασιλέως Περσῶν of A, N, 52, 55, 64, 119, 245, 248, Alex. (58, in part). The Vulg. agrees with all other codices in omitting.
- 8:6(7) Colb.="Hierusalem" of AB and most cursives. Vulg. agrees with N, 64, 245, 248, Ald., Alex., Ἱεροσόλυμα, in reading "Jerosolymam."
- 8:20(22) Colb. "sal"=ἄλα of cods. 58, 106, 121, 134, 236(74) and Hebr. But other cods. have ἀλλά, and similarly Vulg. "alia."
- 8:21(23) Colb. "diligenter"=ἐπιμελῶς of most Gk MSS. Vulg., however, omits with B, L, and 71, 74.

- 8:55(56) Colb. "sicut muneravit" = οὕτως ἐδωρήσαντο of most codices. The Vulgate has ἃ ἐδωρησατο of cods. 68, 71, 120, 121, 236, 245.
- 8:64(68) Colb. "Syriae" = Συρίας simply of B and L. V, however, has "Coelesyriae" = κοιλῆς Συρίας of A.
- 8:65(69) Colb. "ad Esdram" = τῷ Ἑσδρα of 19, 108. But Vulgate "ad me" = μοι of AB.

The same differences of first and third persons, with necessary supplemental changes, occur in the verses immediately following, 8:68(72); 69(73); 71(75); the Old Latin in all cases agreeing with L against the Vulgate and AB.

3. *The Old Latin and the Vulgate Closer to the A Group than to the Hexaplaric Text*

I have previously in this article referred to Greek A as being nearer the type of Greek transmitted by the Latin than is the B group. This is important to note, for B has regularly been accepted with slight question as being superior to the A tradition; yet the Old Latin is a powerful witness, and ought not to be lightly passed over. The following list is anything but exhaustive. The A readings are given first.

- 1:8 Συήλος] in some A cods. appearing as Ησύλος; O.L. "Suelus" (the Vulgate has omitted the entire line by accident). But B has Ἡσύλος, corrected by Ba^{1b} to ἡ σύνοδος.
- 1:9 πρόβατα πεντακισχίλια] The O.L. and Vulg. have "ovium(oves) quinque millia." But B has πρόβατα χίλια.
- 1:36(38) Ζαρακην] Here the O.L. reads "Zachariam," transposing the consonants ρ and κ for the more familiar name. The Vulgate attests their proper order by "Zaracelem." In B the Greek has become permanently corrupted to Ζάριον.
- 1:53(56) τοὺς ἐπιλοίπους ἀπὸ ῥομφαίας ἀπήγαγον] The Vulgate translates accurately "reliquos a gladio duxerunt," and the O.L. somewhat more freely "reliquos qui remanserunt a gladio duxerunt." But B has changed the Greek around slightly, and so "improved" (?) to read with different meaning τοὺς ἐπιλοίπους ἀπήγαγεν μετὰ ῥομφαίας.
- 2:16(17) κριταί] This is omitted by B, but appears in A just before ἐν κοίλῃ Συρία καὶ Φοινίκη. It is attested in both the O.L. and the Vulgate by "judices."

A slight, though suggestive, variation occurs in 2:20(24), where instead of κάθοδος—O.L. and Vulg. "descensus"—B has ἕξοδος.

- 4:45 Ἰδουμαῖοι] Both O.L. and Vulg. have "Idumaei"; but B reads Ἰουδαῖοι. The same divergences appear again in 4:50.

The argument from the forms of proper names is largely vitiated by the fact that they have passed through such a long process of corruption in the Latin itself. Nevertheless the trend of the evidence seems to me unmistakable, for some of the instances are quite clear and convincing.

5:9 Σαφατ] This name is supported by "Safat" of O.L. But both B and Vulg. omit. B does, it is true, have an Ασαφ written in the margin from a later hand; but the omission by Vulg. indicates that some texts did not have it.

5:11 Φααθ] in the compound Φααθμωαβ. Colb. has "Fammoabis," joining the following εἰς of the Greek to the proper name. The Vulg. reads "Phoemo," omitting the remainder. But B has Φθαλει.

Ιωαβ] Colb. "Job," and Vulg. "Joabes." B reads Ροβοαβ.

5:14 Αδινου] Colb. reads "Adinue" and Vulg. "Adin"; but B has Αδελιου.

8:2 Αμαριου] Vulg. has "Ameri," and Colb. with a familiar corruption "Abariae." B, however, has Αμαρθειου.

Σαδδουκον] Colb. and Vulg. "Sadoc." But B reads Σαδδουλουκον.

5:24 'Ανασιβ (or Σανασιβ)] Colb. has "Enassibe," and Vulg. "Eliasib." B reads Σαναβεις, transposing the last two consonants.

5:32 Μεεδδα] This is supported by Colb. "Gedda," and is rendered exactly by Vulg. "Meedda." But B has Αεδδα.

Immediately following, Gk A reads υἱοὶ Κυθα, υἱοὶ Χαρεια, the original of Colb. "filii Cutha, filii Caret," and of Vulg. "filii Phusa, filii Caree." But B omits entirely. In this same verse "Barches" of Colb. and "Barcus" of Vulg. are closer to Βαρχουε of A than Βαχονς of B.

5:37 Δαλαν] This form is attested by Colb. "Dathan" and by Vulg. "Dalari"; but B has Ασαν.

9:31 Αδδι Νααθος] Colb. has "Jadina Athus" and Vulg. "Addin Naathus." B has Αδδεν Λαθος.

9:34 Ιωσηθος] Vulg. has "Josephus" (Colb. omits); B has Φωσηπος.

9:46 Εσδρας] Colb. reads "Esdra" and Vulg. "Esdras"; but B has Αζαριας.

9:48 Ιακουβος Σαβαταιος] Colb. has "Acub et Sabbathaeus" and Vulg. "Accubus et Sabbathaeus." But B reads Ιαρσουβοος, Αβταιος.

9:31 Ματθανιας] Colb. has "Matthanias" and Vulg. "Mathathias." B, however, reads Βεσκασπασμυς.

Certain of the plus and minus quantities of A and B are quite important in this regard. For example, in 7:4b A has a line not found in B, but attested by the Old Latin; it is *ἕως τοῦ ἔκτου ἔτους Δαρίου Βασιλέως Περσῶν*, exactly equivalent to "usque in sextum annum Darii regis Persarum" of Colb.

8:20(22) At the end of this verse A reads *καὶ ἄλλα ἐκ πλήθους πάντα*. This is supported by Colb. and Vulg. alike. Colb. has "caetera sine

- mensura. Omnia," and Vulg. "alia (quaecumque abundant) sine taxatione. Omnia." B, however, omits entirely.
- 8:8(9) B omits a line, δὲ τοῦ γραφέντος προστάγματος, found in A and supported by both the Old Latin and the Vulgate.
- 8:25(28) καὶ εἶπεν Εσδρας ὁ γραμματεὺς] B omits; but its authenticity is attested by Colb. "Et dixit Esdras," by Vulg. "Et dixit Esdras scriba," and by Mansi also.
- 8:46(48) In the place of ἄνδρα ἐπιστημόνα of B, A reads καὶ ἤγαγεν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν κρατείαν χεῖρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἄνδρας ἐπιστημόνας. The Vulgate has "et adduxerunt nobis secundum manum validam Domini (Dei) nostri viros peritos," and Colb. "et adduxerunt nobis secundum fortem Domini viros peritos."
- 8:47(49) A has at the beginning of this verse καὶ Ἀσεβιαν καὶ Ἀννοννον καὶ Ὡσαιαν ἀδελφον, attested by Colb. in "et Asbiam et Annunum et Aman fratrem" and by Vulg. in "Asbiam et Amin"; but B omits.
- 9:11 Both Colb. and Vulg. agree with A in omitting καὶ οὐκ εὗρομεν found in B.
- 9:9 B omits the words τῶν γυναικῶν in the phrase ἀπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν τῶν ἀλλογενῶν. It is rendered "ab uxoribus aliaenigenis" by the Old Latin and by the Vulgate alike.
- 8:51(52) B omits αἰτῆσαι τὸν βασιλέα, preserved by A, and rendered by Colb. and Vulg. "petere a rege."
- B also omits καὶ (cod. 19, εἰς) προπομπήν of A, and attested by "deductionem" of Colb. and "in comitatu" of Vulg.
- 8:56(58) χρυσοειδῆ] Colb. has "simili auro" and Vulg. "auri speciem"; but B omits.
- 8:61(63) B omits τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τετάρτῃ of A. Colb. has "quarta die" and Vulg. similarly "quarta (autem) die."

There are also a number of minor phenomena of the same general character; but since to make an exhaustive comparison of the Greek falls outside the scope of this article, I have purposely refrained from including them. I have aimed to present sufficient proof merely to show beyond the possibility of a doubt the general agreement of both Latin texts with the MSS of the A family rather than with those of the Hexaplaric group. This does not mean that the Latin never follows the Hexaplaric Greek rather than the A family; for that there should be no instances in which the Hexaplaric Greek has preserved a superior reading, or that the Latin has never had an inferior reading of the Greek before it, is more than could reasonably be expected; but that it inclines to A rather than to B in nine cases out of ten is, I feel sure, a modest estimate.

VII. THE OLD LATIN FROM A GREEK TEXT OF THE SYRIAN TYPE

Having shown that the Old Latin and the Vulgate are independent versions, and are descended from different Greek originals, our next step is to point out that the Old Latin, at least, is from a type of Greek which differed at important points from the "Egyptian" tradition preserved in the A and B groups. Much of this evidence has already been presented in our discussion of the contention that the Old Latin and the Vulgate are from different Greek originals; and so much of the data as have been touched upon in previous sections will be alluded to as briefly as possible at this point. Following are some of the more important instances. Many of the passages show but slight variations, yet all are significant.

1:3 Colb. "et posuerunt arcam sanctam," which reading is attested by cod. 108 *καὶ ἔθηκαν τὴν ἀγίαν κιβωτόν*. All codices of the AB groups, however, have *ἐν τῇ θέσει τῆς ἀγίας κιβωτοῦ*, and this latter is what the translator of the Vulgate had before him. Furthermore, the Syriac in a conflate reading attests both Colb. and Vulgate.

1:4 Colb. prefixes "et dixit," attested by cod. 108 (and by Gk of II Chron. 35:3). But all other Gk codices, together with Vulgate, omit.

Colb. "nunc autem" is equivalent to cod. 108, *νῦν οὖν*. The other Gk cods. have *καὶ νῦν*, from which Vulg. gets "et nunc."

Colb. "domus cognationum vestrarum secundum vices dierum" is attested by cod. 108 (and Syr.), *τὸν οἶκον τῶν πατριῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς ἐφημερίας*. Gk A has, however, [*καὶ ἐτοιμάσει*] *κατὰ τὰς πατρίδας καὶ τὰς φυλάς*, and this is the original of the Vulgate, "secundum pagos & tribus vestras."

Colb. "secundum constitutionem regis" must be a somewhat free rendering of Colb., *διὰ χειρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως* (translated literally by the Syriac); for it cannot be from Gk AB *κατὰ τὴν μεγαλειότητα*, equivalent to Vulg. "secundum magnificentiam."

1:6 Colb. "et pars domus cognationis Levitis et" has no point of similarity with Gk AB, but is exactly equivalent to cod. 108 (again supported by the Syriac), *καὶ μέρος οἴκου πατρίδας τοῖς Λευίταις*. καὶ Gk AB has merely *ἐν τάξει*, which even Vulg. omits—thus suggesting that it is a later expansion in the Gk, or at least from a different stream than Vulg. represents, and so conflate in cod. 108.

1:5 Colb. "state" cannot come from Gk AB *στάντες* or *πάντες*, but only from cod. 108, *στήτε*.

1:7(8) Colb. "et principes ejus dederunt initia" has not the slightest resemblance to Gk AB *κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν*, but is an exact translation of the Gk preserved by cod. 108, *καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτοῦ ἀπῆρξαντο*.

Similarly in 1:9 Colb. has "initia dederunt," cod. 108, ἀπήρξαντο. Gk AB = ἔδωκαν.

But possibly the most striking instance is found in 1:10-11. Here L has preserved two long variant readings almost in their entirety. They are so closely parallel that whenever there is an omission in one or the other it is possible to reconstruct with almost absolute assurance the original reading. First L records the Greek from which the Old Latin was made, and follows with the Greek of AB, the original of the Vulgate. (See the text of the passage printed above, under "III. The Witness of the Greek Texts.")

The long omission in the AB form of the Greek, as well as the closer parallel of *La*, proves conclusively that Colb. comes from a different type of Greek from AB. The omission in AB evidently occurred through the presence of a second *κατὰ τὰς μεριδαρχίας*⁹ before τῶν πατέρων; for to correspond with this *La* has ἐπὶ τὰς διαιρέσεις . . . κατὰ τὰς διαιρέσεις. But this corruption also evidently took place quite early, for it is followed closely by the Vulgate.

It is true that L has no parallel for "habebant azyma secundum constitutionem," but in the light of the other parallels it is almost certain that this has been omitted by accident, though possibly by design for a slightly smoother reading of the conflated text.

- 1:11(12) Colb., "immolaverunt vitulos" = cod. 108, ἔθυσαν τοὺς μόσχους; but AB have οὕτω τὸ πρῶτον.
 1:12(13) Colb., "filiis populo, et ex his" = cod. 108, τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν; but Gk AB has τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα.
 1:13(14) Colb., "adipes et holocausta" = cod. 108, τὰ στέατα καὶ ὀλοκαντώματα. But Gk AB has τὰ στέατα only; so Vulg. "adipes" only.
 1:15 Colb. adds "& principes" = cod. 108, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες. All other Gk omits.
 1:15(16) Colb., "portarum non discedebant unusquisque a servitute sua" is much nearer to cod. 108, πύλης καὶ πύλης οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς κινεῖσθαι ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτῶν than it is to AB ἐφ' ἑκάστου πυλῶνος· οὐκ ἔστι παραβῆναι ἕκαστον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐφημερίαν.
 1:16(17) Colb. prefixes "et directum est" = cod. 108, καὶ κατωρθώθη. No other Gk has this.

⁹ *μεριδαρχίας* may be a substitution for the original reading *διαίσεις* by the Egyptian recensors; but in any case it is clear that the omitted section is the result of *homoioteleuton* in the Greek, and that this occurred relatively early.

- 1:16(18) Colb., "ut facerent Pascha, et offerent holocausta"=cod. 108, τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ φασεχ καὶ ἐνεγκεῖν τὰ δλοκαντώματα, to correspond with which Gk AB has simply ἀχθῆναι τὸ πάσχα.
- 1:18(20) Colb., "a diebus"=cod. 108, ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμερῶν. Gk AB has ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων.
- 2:6 Colb., "& dent animum Domino"=cod. 108, καὶ προθυμείσθωσαν τῷ Κυρίῳ. No other Gk codex has this.
- 3:21(22) Colb., "sine litteris," cannot be a translation of Gk AB διὰ τάλαντων (Vulg., "per talanta"), but of Gk represented by cod. 108, διὰ γραμμάτων—an original δίχα becoming διὰ through error of transmission. Even Sang. retains "sine litteris."
- 4:52 The omission of ἑπτακαίδεκα before τάλαντα, found in all Gk except cod. 108, by Colb., Sang., Vulg., and Syriac.
- 4:55 Colb., "dari"=cod. 108, δοθῆναι. Gk AB has δοῦναι (=Vulg., "dare").
- 6:3 Colb. has "cum eis," equivalent to αὐτοῖς in the phrase συνόντων αὐτοῖς τῶν προφητῶν. Gk AB omits this αὐτοῖς, and it is preserved in L only. It is further attested by the Vulg., which has "eis."
- 6:31 The reading "hostiae . . . instanter" of Colb. has no parallel in AB, but is supported by L in αἱ θυσίαι . . . ἐνδελεχῶς.
- 8:90(95) Colb. inserts an "exsurgentes dixerunt Esdrae," supported by L, but occurring in no AB MS except the doubtful cod. 121.
(Cod. 121 lies between AB and L, and in this particular section is closer to L.)
- 9:1 Colb. has no equivalent for Ἰωνὰν τοῦ Νασίβου. This might be regarded as an accidental omission but for the fact that L also omits entirely.

Many more illustrations could be adduced, but it seems to me that these are already more than sufficient. The conclusion is, that the Old Latin version of First Esdras, now surviving in the Colbertinus MS, was a generally faithful (though occasionally somewhat free) rendering of a Greek text of the Syro-Palestinian type which formed the basis of the L recension.

VIII. THE VULGATE AND OUR EGYPTIAN GREEK TEXT

There is no doubt that the Vulgate follows, in general, the Egyptian type of text; but it is important to observe that its Greek original differed, at a number of points, from the form of the Egyptian recension which is known to us. The instances are neither very numerous nor very striking where these points of departure from the Egyptian Greek occur; moreover a number of them might individually be explained on other grounds. Yet enough of them, it

seems to me, show unmistakable evidence of coming from a Greek text which had readings no longer preserved in our Egyptian Greek to carry with them most of the other less certain cases. Some of these unusual readings, as we should expect, are supported by the L Greek.

In 4:63 we have the conclusion of an account of the religious ceremonies and festivities which accompanied the arrival of the royal decree permitting the return and authorizing the rebuilding of the temple. Colb. ends with "et cymbalis percutiebant cum musicis in gaudio magno diebus septem." Sang. reads "et exsultaverunt cum cymbalis et cum musicis percutiebant diebus septem," this being manifestly a conflation of the Old Latin with the Vulgate "et exsultaverunt cum musicis et laetitia diebus septem." There is here not the slightest suspicion of contamination of the Vulgate from the Old Latin. Now every extant Greek manuscript reads *καὶ ἐκωθωνίζοντο μετὰ μουσικῶν καὶ χαρᾶς ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ*. This can certainly not be the verb which the Old Latin read here; for *κωθωνίζω* means "to drink heavily; to get drunk," and we could explain such rendering only on the grounds of a great softening of what sounded like a very harsh and unpleasant statement to the translator. It is easier to suppose a different Greek reading, especially as a simple conjectural change in the present Greek supplies the very word we want; it is the substitution of δ for θ ; for the verb *κωδωνίζω* gives just the meaning we require, and was undoubtedly before the translator of the Old Latin. Whether or not this was the original of the Vulgate rendering "exsultaverunt" is admittedly doubtful, for the conjectured *κωδωνίζω* means properly "to make a clanging noise by striking bells or cymbals," and although "exsultaverunt" might well be used to translate such a verb, it might also be a softening of the objectionable *κωθωνίζω*. In any event this instance has served to indicate that the Old Latin, at least, has preserved readings quite lost in the Greek. Of course, this is hardly a separate Greek reading; but rather indicates a very slight corruption of the original. It is merely suggestive of what might and unquestionably did often occur in the transmission of the text, viz., that a certain reading should become *entirely* excluded or supplanted by another.

A somewhat similar instance is found in 6:25. The text here

seems a trifle confused, and may have been corrupt when the translations were made. But if so, it appears to have become even more corrupt since; for in place of the phrase *διὰ δόμων* both Colb. and Vulgate have "quadratum." This coincidence in two versions otherwise quite diverse is not without a certain force. Whatever the original, we can be reasonably certain it was *not διὰ δόμων*.

A third important passage bearing on this point is 3:21. All Gk MSS have *καρδίας ποιῇ πλουσίας*, and this reading is followed by the Mansi version, "animas facit divites." Both Colb. and Vulg. give quite a different meaning. Colb. has "corda facit honesta" (so also Sang.), and Vulg. has "praecordia facit honesta." In view of this fact it would appear that the Greek original of the Old Latin and the Vulgate was probably *ἀπλούσας*, a relatively easy variant of *πλουσίας*.

- 1:9 Vulg. has "vitulos quingentos," supported by cod. 108, *μόσχους πεντακοσίους*. All other Gk reads *μόσχους ἑπτακοσίους*.
- 1:14 Gk AB has *τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἀδελφοῖς*. But Vulg. (and Colb.) omit any equivalent for *ἱερεῖσιν*, reading simply "fratribus."
- 1:37(39) "in terra Juda" of the Vulg. (Colb., Sang.= "in Judaea") is closer to cod. 108, *ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ* than to AB *τῆς Ἰουδαίας*.
- 4:52 All Gk, except cod. 108, have *ἑπτακαίδεκα* before *τάλαντα*. Vulg., Colb., Sang., and Syriac all agree with cod. 108 in omitting.
- 8:60(62) Vulg., "Thia" = L, *Θεια*, and not AB, *Θερα*.
- 8:88(92) Vulg. adds "et juvenculae" to its list of the returning exiles—the "viri et mulieres et juvenes"—only in L, *καὶ παιδάρια*. (Even Colb. omits this!)
- 9:12 Vulg. has an "apud se," only in L, *παρ' ἑαυτοῖς*. Colb. likewise reads "apud se."
- 9:13 Vulg., "ex omni loco" = L, *ἐξ ἐκάστου τόπου*, and not AB, *ἐκ τοῦ τόπου*.
- 1:33(35) A slight indication of a different reading is the unusual "Jerusalemis" = L, *Ἱεροσολύμοις*, where all other Gk has *Ἱερουσαλήμ*. Colb. likewise has "Jerusalemis."
- 4:48 The word *κοίλη* in the phrase *κοίλη Συρία καὶ Φοινίκη* is omitted by both Vulg. and Colb. All Greek has this full expression, and it also appears in Sang. and Mans.; but as the former of these two MSS shows evidence of late correction from the AB type of Greek, and the latter is a late translation anyway, their testimony is of relatively small value. On the other hand, we see from such passages as 1:10-11 that the AB families early suffered some slight permanent corruption; so that it seems to me most probable that the Vulg. and

- the Colb. did come from a text which lacked the *κοίλῃ*—either because slightly inferior, or else that this word was subsequently added to make the phrase conform to the usual one, as above.
- 6:2(3) Vulg. “cum adessent eis prophetae Domni et” is exactly equivalent to L *συνόντων αὐτοῖς τῶν προφητῶν τοῦ Κυρίου καί*; but AB omits *αὐτοῖς*, and *καί* is preserved doubtfully only by cod. 58.
- 6:10(11) Both Vulg. and Colb. omit any equivalent for *τούτων* in the phrase *τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τούτων*, though all Greek except cods. 19 and 44 have it. Inasmuch as cod. 44 is very prone to abridge, it is probably safe to ignore this one A codex, and regard L alone as preserving the original text of Vulg. and Colb.
- 6:11(12) Both Vulg. and Colb. begin the verse with “idea.” No support for this reading is found in the present Greek, and it may possibly be a free rendering in each version; yet the Hebrew has *אָנִי*, which is far from being conclusive, it is true, but which may yet indicate an authentic Greek equivalent.
- 8:40 This entire verse is wanting in both Vulg. and Colb. It appears in AB and L; but that its omission is scarcely accidental in the Latin is attested by the omission likewise by cods. 52, 119, and by the fact that cod. 64 has it only in a marginal reading.

A rather doubtful, but not impossible, passage occurs in 1:24(26), where *πρὸς αὐτόν* of ABL (Colb., “ad eum”) is rendered “ad Josiam” by the Vulgate. This certainly sounds like an interpretative paraphrase. On the other hand, Vulg. is not given to free renderings; nor does there seem to be the slightest need of such an interpretation here; for there is no ambiguity in the reading of Colb. “ad eum.” It is fortunate, therefore, that we have a reading which is an exact equivalent of the Vulgate, *πρὸς Ἰωσίαν*, given by Theodotion, in *Cat. Nic.*, ii, 943.

In addition, the Vulgate occasionally agrees with Colb. against AB in difference of tense or mood; e.g., in 8:24(27), where AB has *κολασθήσονται*, the Vulgate renders “plectantur” (Colb., “punientur”). But L has *κολαζέσθωσαν*.

It is at just this point that the Mansi version furnishes some valuable corroboratory evidence. In 4:34 our present Greek reads *καὶ ταχὺς τῷ δρόμῳ ὃ ἥλιος ὅτι στρέφεται ἐν τῷ κύκλῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κτλ*, which finds no exact equivalent in any Latin version. Colb. reads “et velox cursus solis convertitur in gyro coeli etc.,” and Vulg., “et velox cursus solis convertit in gyro coelum etc.” The evidence

of these two versions in themselves would be rather doubtful, even though we know that as versions they are quite independent. Even the witness of Sang., "et velox cursus solis quem convertit," etc., would hardly prove beyond a doubt that the Latin has preserved authentic readings; though the addition of "quem" may indicate that its redactor has referred to the Greek at this point, and if so, it would be easiest to conclude that the Greek the redactor had before him was very similar to that which we would naturally think the original translators of Colb. and the Vulgate had before them, with the addition of some particle similar to the *ὅτι* of the present Greek. But when we take into account the independent witness of the Mansi version, with its different vocabulary and its different idiom, reading "et citatus cursu solis regredietur," etc., it becomes practically certain that Colb. and Vulg. do represent an authentic Greek reading. Furthermore, we can trace the development of the corruption in the Greek. The earlier form of the Greek was undoubtedly *καὶ ταχὺς ὁ δρόμος τοῦ ἡλίου στρέφεται κτλ*, attested by Colb. and Vulg. The next distinct step was that suggested by Mans., when *ὁ δρόμος* becomes *τῷ δρόμῳ*. The third stage is our present Greek.

A similar case appears in 8:12(13), where Gk A reads *ἀκολουθῶς ὡς ἔχει* (119, *ὡς ἔχεις*. B, *ὡς ἔχεις*) *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Κυρίου*. Now Colb. reads "et obedient omnes legi Dei," which at first sight looks like an all around corruption, or a very free paraphrase. But when we compare the rendering of the Vulgate, which here as elsewhere follows the Greek quite closely—"observantes sicut habes in lege Domini"—it seems far simpler and more probable to conjecture an original *ἀκολουθοῦντες* in place of the present *ἀκολουθῶς*. And this conjecture is supported by the Mansi version, which has "quod consequens est secundum legem quam habes." To be sure, the text is not perfectly certain here, and the order is reversed as well; but the form of the Mansi version can better be explained on the basis of a participle rather than a preposition in the Greek, or possibly both participle and preposition by dittography. The Mansi rendering also suggests that this participle had become singular instead of plural at the time this version was made, and so provides an easy step for the change to its present form.

Inasmuch as it is a characteristic of the Mansi translator to shorten redundant expressions, it is not always easy to determine whether or not he had such expanded form of the Greek before him. But in a few instances I think we can say, without any hesitancy, that he probably did not. One such is found in 4:37 in *πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα*. Every Greek codex has this (except 245, which omits the entire section.) Yet every Latin version—Colb., Vulg., and Mans.—omits the second member, *πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα*. In view of this fact it seems to me that we must regard the *πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα* as a corruption of *πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν*.

Somewhat different is the case of the *τότε* which appears twice in 4:41 in the line *καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τότε ἐφώνησεν καὶ τότε εἶπον*. This *τότε* is omitted in each instance by Vulg. and Mans., and Colb. has it only at the beginning in "*tunc omnis populus*" etc., i.e., as if from *τότε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς κτλ*. That Colb. preserves the Aramaic idiom is apparent at once; for *τότε* must be here, as elsewhere, simply the rendering of the familiar *ܐܝܢܐ* or *ܐܝܢܐ* used only to introduce a clause. Evidently this *τότε* which was in the Greek original of Colb.—but probably not in the original of Vulg. and Mans.—eventually became a part of all Greek MSS through conflation, and at last was repeated a second time by copyists.

Another example of late accretion appears in 4:46 where all Greek codices agree in reading *ἵνα ποιήσῃς τὴν εὐχὴν ἣν ἠῤῥω τῷ βασιλεῖ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ποιῆσαι ἐκ στόματός σου*, but where Colb., Vulg., and Mans. are at one in omitting the word *ποιῆσαι*. In view of their united testimony it is improbable that this phrase appeared in the Greek from which these translations were made, though of course not impossible that it was in some Greek tradition by this time. It may possibly have originated in a careless repetition of the preceding *ποιήσῃς*.

In 4:47 in the list of officers, *οἰκονόμους καὶ τοπάρχας καὶ στρατηγούς καὶ σατράπας*, both Vulgate and Mansi lack an equivalent for *καὶ τοπάρχας*, though Colb. has "*et praefectos locorum*." All Greek codices have the list in full; yet the insecurity of the text is indicated by the varying order in the different codices. Since these lists are especially subject to addition—cf. 3:2; 3:14; 4:49; Dan. 3:2—and as it is difficult to suppose that either Mans. or Vulg.

would have omitted this phrase had it been in the Greek which their authors had before them, we should probably conclude that here, too, we have an accurate translation of the Greek original of these two Latin versions.

Probably the word *μόνος*—8:25(28)—in the phrase *εὐλογητὸς μόνος ὁ κύριος* is likewise a late accretion. All Greek except cods. 71 and 108 have it; but Colb., Vulg., and Mans. alike omit.

In 2:14(15) the Greek reads *ἀνενέχθη δὲ ὑπὸ Σαναβασσαρου ἄμα τοῖς ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*. For this Colb. has “adtulit Sabassarum cum his qui revertebantur de Babylonia in Hierosolimam,” and Vulg. “et enumerata sunt Salmanassarum simul cum his qui ex captivitate Babyloniae venerunt in Hierosolimam.” Separately either one of these might be regarded as a rather free translation, but hardly so collectively; for, although the phrase *οἱ ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας* did become practically equivalent to “the returned” and might be so rendered by some translators, there is no reason to think that the Latin translators of I Esdras so rendered it. On the contrary, in the other instances where we meet this expression it is uniformly translated “captivitas” by both Colb. and Vulg.; cf. 5:7; 5:54(56); 5:64(67); 6:8; 6:27(28); 7:6; 7:10, 12, 13; 8:63(66); 8:74(78); 9:3; 9:15. Moreover, in the present instance the Vulgate has, as usual, this phrase “qui ex captivitate,” but has added a word not found in any Greek text—“venerunt”—though supported by Colb. “revertebantur.” Therefore the presumption which naturally arises from the fact that the Vulgate does stick so very literally to the Greek receives important verification in this case also. For there is no apparent reason why the addition of “venerunt” should have been deemed necessary by the Vulgate translator. But there is one further consideration; the Colb. translator evidently did not have *ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας* in the Greek which was before him, but some verbal form which he rendered “revertebantur.” This is so closely parallel to the Vulgate “venerunt” that I cannot help thinking that instead of *ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας* the author of Colb. read some participial form of *ἔρχομαι* or *βαίνω*. We should then have to suppose that the Vulgate translator had before him a Greek text that was conflated with these two readings, and that our present Greek has descended from one form

of the tradition only. It seems to me that this is quite probable. Cf., however, 5:64(67).

Chap. 5 contains several examples of proper names found in both Colb. and Vulg., but wanting in the Greek. On internal evidence it is difficult to suppose that these have been introduced into one version from the other; so that we are shut up to the conclusion that they really appeared in some Greek codices of the period from which the Latin versions date.

In 5:16 Colb. has "filii Erdaenabae, DCXXXII" and Vulg., "filii Jedarbone, centum triginta duo," which finds no equivalent in the Greek. The two forms of the name are really remarkably close, the Vulgate having merely transposed the order of the consonants as found in the Colb. The name seems to be a compound of נְבִי and יֶרְדָּ.

At the end of 5:20 Colb. has "qui de Aebeae CXXVII" and Vulg., "qui ex Bastaro centum viginti duo," which also has no equivalent in the Greek.

Again in 5:26 Colb. has an "Eredian" and Vulg. a "Serebias" not found in the Greek.

Between 5:26 and 5:27 of the Greek there is an entire verse in the Latin. Colb. has "filii et filiae et mulieres; omnis numerus DCCXLII"; and Vulg. "filii et filiae et uxores; omnis computatio quadraginta millia ducenti quadraginta duo." These agree closely in meaning; while Colb. "mulieres . . . numerus," corresponding to Vulg. "uxores . . . computatio," argues against the suspicion of corruption of one version from the other. The chief objection lies in the fact that this verse seems to contain data repeated in 5:1 and 5:41; but even if the possibility be granted that this verse may be made up from the last-mentioned passages, it does not follow that the Latin translators were guilty of this act; but rather, on the contrary, that they simply followed what was already in the Greek which they had.

In 5:34 Colb. has "filii Ami, filii Saphiu"; and Vulg., "filii Amae, filii Sasus," which is not in the Greek.

The Vulgate again agrees with Colb. against the Greek in 5:53(55). The Greek reads *καὶ ἔδωκαν . . . χάρῃα . . . εἰς τὸ παράγειν . . . ξύλα κέδρινα καὶ διαφέρειν σχεδίας εἰς τὸν Ἰόππης λιμένα.*

But instead of the last clause Colb. has "et facerent rates in portu Joppen" and Vulg. "et facerent rates in Joppe portu." It is highly improbable that the Latin could have come from the above form of the Greek. It is easier to suppose a Greek text which read *καὶ ποιῆσαι σχεδίας ἐν τῷ Ἰόππης λιμένι*.

Of some slight value is the variation in 5:54(56), where in place of a singular *παραγενόμενος* the Latin has a plural. The Colb. reads "venerunt" and the Vulgate "venientes," as if from *παραγενόμενοι*, and this is further supported by *נָכְיָם* of the Hebrew.

The two following examples have the support of Gk L. The first occurs in 5:57(59) in the phrase *μετὰ μουσικῶν καὶ σαλπύγγων*. Colb., Vulg., and Gk L alike omit *μουσικῶν καὶ*. The second occurs in 6:20(21), in the line *νῦν οὖν εἰ κρίνεται, βασιλεῦ, ἐπισκεπήτω*. Here Gk L has preserved the reading *εἰ κρίνεις . . . ἐπισκεφθήτω*, translated by Colb., "nunc ergo, si judicas, rex, requiratur" and by Vulg., "nunc ergo, si judicatur a te, o rex, perquiratur."

Finally, at the very end of the I Esdras fragment there appears in the Latin a verse not found in the Greek. It is universally recognized that 9:55 breaks off abruptly with the words *καὶ ἐπισυνήχθησαν*, and what Greek words followed is at best a mere matter of conjecture. Greek L sought to correct the difficulty, or at least to improve the situation, by borrowing from the Greek of Neh. 8:13. Something like this appears to have been the situation in the Greek original of Colb. and Vulg. The Colb. adds "omnes in Hierusalem jocundari secundum dispositionem Domini Dei Israel," and the Vulg. has "universi in Jerusalem celebrare laetitiam secundum testamentum Domini Dei Israel." It is perfectly clear that the above is not a translation of Gk L; yet that these Latin versions do represent a real translation or translations from some Greek text is, in my judgment, beyond dispute. Whether or not the Vulgate is here an independent translation, or merely a more elegant phrasing of the Old Latin, may not be certain. Judging from a comparison of the two versions as a whole, I should say that interdependence is not very probable, and the differences in vocabulary and idiom in this particular passage rather bear out this presupposition. On the other hand, it is easier to allow the possibility of such borrowing

at the end of a book; and especially where, as here, something had manifestly been lost from the Greek.

It may be urged in objection that it is extremely improbable that readings in existence so late as it is assumed certain of these must have been would have been so completely lost. I can only point to the evidence, and let it speak for itself. The corrupt and fragmentary condition of many Greek codices suggests a possible explanation. It is not urged that the Latin is superior at these points of divergence, but only that it may be so at certain of them. Some further light on this subject may perhaps be found in the Appendix, below, which aims to show how our present Greek, of the Egyptian type especially, has suffered permanent change through conflation. It is quite certain that we do not possess in its purity the original Egyptian recension.

APPENDIX

EXAMPLES OF CONFLATION IN THE EGYPTIAN GREEK

The foregoing discussion has shown, I think, that the Latin versions are important aids to the textual criticism of the Greek of I Esdras. Our study of individual passages has indicated that the present Greek is by no means of irreproachable integrity. A number of cases have been shown where the Greek seems to have suffered permanent alteration in transmission, and where sense and witness of the versions alike demand reconstruction. So we may be prepared to find that among other things incidental to the fortunes of textual transmission Gk A or Gk B have become slightly conflated from variant readings. The instances of the kind are not numerous, it is true; but it will probably be agreed that the most of the following are most satisfactorily explained on the assumption of accidental conflation.

A simple and fairly certain example occurs in 8:85(89), where all Greek codices agree in reading *ἕως τοῦ μὴ καταλιπεῖν ῥίζαν καὶ σπέρμα καὶ ὄνομα ἡμῶν*. The conflation lies in the two variants *καὶ σπέρμα* and *καὶ ὄνομα*. For that these are merely variant translations is indicated not merely by the fact that the Hebrew has only the ambiguous פְּלִטָּה, but also by the fact that Colb.—“et semen,” without any equivalent for *ὄνομα*—evidently had only the former

of these two expressions, while the Vulgate had only the second of the two, as shown by its "nomen" without any rendering of *σπέρμα*. This explanation of the above phenomena is borne out by a comparison of another passage, 8:75(79), preceding this one by only a few verses, in which the phrase *ρίζαν καὶ ὄνομα* appears, and which without a doubt gives the clue to the appearance of *ὄνομα* in the passage under discussion. The explanation is this: Originally the Greek read simply *ρίζαν καὶ σπέρμα ἡμῶν*, as indicated by our oldest witness, the Old Latin; next, some copyist, with the previous *ρίζαν καὶ ὄνομα* of 8:75(79) ringing in his ears, wrote *ὄνομα* instead of *σπέρμα* here, and this form is witnessed to by the Vulgate. Finally, this error was "corrected" by a later hand in the margin or in some equally easy and natural way crept into all the Greek manuscripts.

A similar, though somewhat less certain, instance occurs in 2:23 (27), where the present Greek reads *βασιλεῖς ἰσχυροὶ καὶ σκληροί*. Here Colb. has "reges duri" only, and the Vulgate "reges fortissimi" only. Again, the Aramaic has but one word, *ܕܝܪܝܢ*, while for textual evidence there is the slight support of cod. 71, which has *σκληροί* only, and of cod. 44, which has *ἰσχυροί* only. The tendency of these two codices to abridge discounts the weight of their testimony very considerably; yet it is not utterly to be ignored when it falls in line with other strong witnesses. In this case also the Greek of Ezra 4:20 has *ἰσχυροί* only.

If we have been correct in our estimate of the Mansi version, it would appear that the reading in 4:37—*πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα*—is conflate. For all three Latin versions omit the second number of the Greek phrase, which is probably merely a corrupt writing of the first member, *πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν*.

Again, the *τότε* which appears twice in 4:41 in the line *καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τότε ἐφώνησεν καὶ τότε εἶπεν* seems to have been introduced into our present Greek texts from a single *τότε* which was in the Greek original of the Colbertinus MS (shown by its "*tunc* omnis populus," etc.; Aramaic *ܕܝܢܐ* or *ܕܝܢܐ*), inasmuch as it does not appear in either the Vulgate or the Mansi version.

Whether the presence in all extant Greek codices of the *καὶ τοπάρχας* in the lists of officers given in 4:47—*οἰκονόμους καὶ τοπάρχας καὶ στρατηγούς καὶ σατράπας*—is the result of comparison

with the Greek original of Colb. or some similar text, or comes from recollection of the lists in 3:2, 3:14, 4:49, Dan. 3:2, it is at least significant that all our present Greek texts have the fuller form; whereas the Vulgate and the Mansi versions agree in omitting the *καὶ τοπάρχας*.

In 4:3 there is almost conclusive evidence of conflation. The Greek reads (a) *πάν ὁ ἐὰν εἴπῃ αὐτοῖς, ἐνακούουσιν*. (b) *ἐὰν εἴπῃ, ποιήτε πόλεμον ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον, ποιούσιν*. The Greek is practically unanimous in the above reading, except that a few A codices have *ποιούσιν* in place of *ἐνακούουσιν*. The Colb. version, however, omits (a) entirely, having simply "si dixerit, facite bellum, invicem faciunt"; while the Vulgate and Mansi versions omit the second part (b), but render the first part (a) accurately. Were we to assume that the originals of Vulgate and Mansi read *ποιούσιν* instead of *ἐνακούουσιν*—as I have remarked that some A codices do—it might be possible to explain the omission in these versions as due to accidental causes through the similarity of the endings; the omission in Mansi might even be due to deliberate excision because of the redundancy of the two clauses, as we have seen; but how to explain the omission of (a) by Colb. on any such grounds it is rather difficult to see. It is easier to suppose that we have a real example of conflation in the Greek, and that the Latin has preserved the original readings. True, the Sangermanensis MS does have an "et obaudiunt ei omnibus," which might be taken to represent a corrupt rendering of (a); but even so, its testimony in such cases is very doubtful because of the fact that it has received recension by the aid of the Greek at what appears to have been a relatively late date; and further, the reading of Sang. is not close enough to the Greek to be at all decisive; the best that can be done is to assume a *πάν[τες] ἐνακούουσιν* as its prototype.

What appears to be a curious example of selective conflation occurs in 8:90(94, 95). The Greek reads *καὶ νῦν ἔστιν ἐπάνω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ. ἐν τούτῳ γενέσθω [οὖν] ὀρκωμοσίᾳ πρὸς τὸν Κύριον . . . ὡς ἐκρίθη σοι καὶ ὅσοι πειθαρχοῦσι τῇ νόμῳ Κυρίου. ἀναστα[ς] ἐπιτέλει*. That the text of the above is by no means certain is shown by the fact that in place of ***a* cod. 19 has *ἐλπὶς ἐστὶ τῇ*

Ἰσραὴλ and cods. 108, 121 have ἐλπὶς τῷ Ἰσραὴλ περὶ τούτου; while in place of the ἐν τούτῳ immediately following ^{**a}, cods. 19, 121 have εἰπὲ καὶ (cod. 108 has εἰπέ, simply). After Κυρίου (*d*) 19, 108 also insert an ^oἀναστάντες εἶπον πρὸς Ἑσδραν^{oe}, and this supports a reading of Colb., and so indicates that the above variants are doubtless authentic ones. Now the Latin versions read:

Vulg., "Et nunc es super omnem Israel. In his ergo sit jusjurandum
Colb., "Et nunc de (populo) Israel in hoc sit juratio
a Domino sicut tibi decretum est a majoribus^{ob}
ad Dominum Et quotquot consenserunt^{*c}
secundum legem Domini^d
legi Moysi, exsurgentes dixerunt Esdrae,^{oe}
exsurgens, explica.
surge et preface.

First of all it is noticeable that neither the Vulg. nor Colb. version follows the present Greek *in toto*. The first part is translated accurately enough by the Vulgate, i.e., through ^{oob}, but the second half appears to be a combination of the Greek originals of both Vulg. and Colb. Here again the conflation does not bear the marks of being deliberate, but is rather the result of a gradual accretion and unconscious growth. I have tried to make the comparison of the Latin versions largely self-explanatory.

These conclusions are supported by another passage, 9:34, equivalent to Ezra 10:34-42. Here the Greek follows the Hebrew quite closely, though as usual only L has exactly the Hebrew equivalent. The peculiarity of this passage lies in the fact that the Colb. translates only the first half of the Greek—the part represented by Ezra 10:34-39—while the Vulgate omits Ezra 10:38, 39 but has vss. 41, 42. Both Colb. and Vulg. omit vs. 40 of the Hebrew; but so does Gk AB, and it is only found in Gk L, except that possibly the last name of this verse שִׁירָא may be represented by the Vulg. "Oziras" and Gk AB Εζωρα. Again, vs. 42 of the Hebrew contains three names, reading in the order יוֹסֵף אֶמְרִיָּה שְׁלֹמֹה; but Gk L, the only witness to have all three, has the order Ἰωσηφ καὶ Σαλλουμ καὶ Ἀμαρίας. Since Gk AB has only Ἰωσηφος and Vulg. only "Josephus," there is

a strong suspicion that this was all that was originally in this place. Also, in vs. 40, above referred to, neither Gk AB nor the Vulgate has any equivalent for the Hebrew **נִכְנַדְבִּי**—Gk L *Ναδαβου*—though a little later in the list Gk AB has a redundant *Ἀζαηλος* (Vulg., “Dielus”). This latter is, however, most likely a doublet of an immediately preceding *Ἐζριλ* (Hebr., **עֲזַרְיָה**); for *Ἀζαηλος* has no support except the above Vulgate reading, and the Vulgate fails to translate the *Ἐζριλ*. All this simply goes to show how very insecure is the text at this point, and that even the Hebrew seems to have suffered from expansion.

Of some slight confirmation is the reading *ἐν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ* of 1:33(35). Both Colb. and Vulg. read simply “super Israel,” and this is supported by *ἐν Ἰσραὴλ* of B, 55, 68, 119, 248 in their *ἐν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ* (most A codices have *ἐν Ἰούδα καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ*). N, 108, and 245, however, have simply *ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*, and the Hebrew has only **בִּירוּשָׁלַם**. Probably, therefore, the longer form is either the result of an easy expansion in the Greek, or else is a pure conflation from a poorly written or abbreviated *Ἱερουσαλήμ*. The significance of these alternatives is much the same.